THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR

Vol. 12 *Autumn* · 1943 *No.* 4

Editorial — *Harlow Shapley*
Jan Christiaan Smuts and the Union of South Africa — *Henry M. Moolman*
Fundamentals of Peace — *Hans Kohn*
Intellectual Criticism — *Darrel Abel*
Sanctuary, *A Poem* — *Nell K. A. Foster*
Friedrich List, Forerunner of Pan-Germanism — *Edward Mead Earle*
Some American Contributions to the Science of Hypnosis — *Frank A. Pattie*
A Westerner Views the U. S. A. — *Edward M. Miller*
College and the Century of the Common Man — *Algo D. Henderson*
Benjamin Franklin as Scientist and Citizen — *I. Bernard Cohen*
Plight of the American Composer — *Alfred Frankenstein*
Virtue and Talents — *Jay C. Knode*

In the Workshop

Mathematics and the War — *R. G. D. Richardson*
Psychiatry and the War — *George S. Stevenson*
George William Hill — *Eric Berger*

Our Readers Comment *Our Authors*

Published Quarterly for General Circulation by

PHI · BETA · KAPPA

$2.50 a year 65 cents a copy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

READING IS UNRATIONED

But Your Time Is Important These Busy Days

Now, More Than Ever, You Should Choose Your Reading Carefully and with Discriminating Taste.

You Should Subscribe to *The American Scholar* If Your Reading Preferences Demand:

QUALITY "... my opinion coincides with that of most people, I believe, in that it is a magazine of very high standards. I read each number carefully and with profit." — *from an editor and astronomy professor.*

VARIETY "I wish to commend the editorial staff upon the uniform excellency of its material and their evident purpose admirably executed to place upon the table of contents a literary menu capable of satisfying the varied tastes of intellectual appetites." — *from a Southern Supreme Court judge.*

PLEASURE "It has been my good fortune to fall heir to a copy of THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR. It has afforded many of us much enjoyment. Since I notice that it is published for general circulation, I enclose check for a one-year subscription." — *from an army captain overseas.*

SUBSCRIBE TO *The American Scholar*

▪ *PUBLISHED QUARTERLY* ▪

12 East 44th Street, New York 17, New York

RATES: **ONE YEAR $2.50 ▪ TWO YEARS $4.50 ▪ THREE YEARS $6.00**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AUTUMN · 1943 VOLUME 12 · No. 4

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR

PHI · BETA · KAPPA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR

Emerson said, "The office of the scholar is to cheer, to raise, and to guide men by showing them facts amidst appearances. He plies the slow, unhonored, and unpaid task of observation. . . . Whatsoever oracles the human heart, in all emergencies, in all solemn hours, has uttered as its commentary on the world of actions,— these he shall receive and impart. And whatsoever new verdict Reason from her inviolable seat pronounces on the passing men and events of today,— this he shall hear and promulgate."

The name of this quarterly is the title of Ralph Waldo Emerson's Phi Beta Kappa address delivered at Harvard in 1837, called by James Russell Lowell "an event without any former parallel in our literary annals," and by Oliver Wendell Holmes "our intellectual Declaration of Independence."

Office of Publication
Rumford Press, Concord, N. H.

Editorial and Executive Offices
Phi Beta Kappa, 12 East 44th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Subscription rates: domestic — one year $2.50, two years $4.50, three years $6.00; foreign and Canadian — 50 cents a year additional for postage.

Published four times a year since 1932 — December, March, June, and October. Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Concord, N. H. under the Act of March 3, 1879.
Copyright, 1943, by the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa. Printed in the U. S. A.

Manuscripts accompanied by addressed and stamped envelopes will be returned if publication is infeasible, but no responsibility is assumed for their loss or injury, or for the views expressed in articles published.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR

Autumn · 1943 *Vol. 12 · No. 4*

CONTENTS

Editorial	*Harlow Shapley*	389
Jan Christiaan Smuts and the Union of South Africa	*Henry M. Moolman*	391
Fundamentals of Peace	*Hans Kohn*	401
Intellectual Criticism	*Darrel Abel*	414
Sanctuary, *A Poem*	*Nell K. A. Foster*	429
Friedrich List, Forerunner of Pan-Germanism	*Edward Mead Earle*	430
Some American Contributions to the Science of Hypnosis	*Frank A. Pattie*	444
A Westerner Views the U. S. A.	*Edward M. Miller*	455
College and the Century of the Common Man	*Algo D. Henderson*	466
Benjamin Franklin as Scientist and Citizen	*I. Bernard Cohen*	474
Plight of the American Composer	*Alfred Frankenstein*	482
Virtue and Talents	*Jay C. Knode*	490

IN THE WORKSHOP

Mathematics and the War	*R. G. D. Richardson*	503
Psychiatry and the War	*George S. Stevenson*	505
George William Hill	*Eric Berger*	507

OUR READERS COMMENT

On "Theater for the Common Man"	*Hazel B. Poole*	508
On "Liberal Socialism"	*Louis Sapir*	508

OUR AUTHORS 509

INDEX TO VOLUME 12 511

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EDITORIAL BOARD

Ruth Benedict	Henry Hazlitt	John W. Nason
Henry S. Commager	Will D. Howe	William A. Neilson
Irwin Edman	James M. Landis	Harlow Shapley
Christian Gauss	Burton E. Livingston	Irita Van Doren

Marjorie Hope Nicolson, *Editor* Dorothy E. Blair, *Production and Circulation*

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Agriculture	Henry C. Taylor
Anthropology	H. J. Spinden
Archaeology	Gisela M. A. Richter
Architecture	Talbot Hamlin
Art	Jere Abbott
Astronomy	Harlow Shapley
Biography	Douglas Southall Freeman
Biology	Edwin G. Conklin
Botany	Edmund W. Sinnott
Business	H. W. Prentis, Jr.
Chemistry	Neil Gordon
Dance	John Martin
Editorial	Herbert Agar
Education	Isaac L. Kandel
Engineering	H. E. Lobdell
Exploration	Vilhjalmur Stefansson
Forestry	Ovid Butler
Geography	John K. Wright
Geology	Eleanora Bliss Knopf
Government & Politics	Arthur T. Vanderbilt
History	J. Salwyn Schapiro
Labor	Sumner H. Slichter
Law	Murray Seasongood
Mathematics	R. G. D. Richardson
Motion Pictures	Frank S. Nugent
Medicine	Hugh Cabot
Municipal Government	C. A. Dykstra
Music	Daniel Gregory Mason
Nutrition and Foods	Henry Sherman
Orient	A. W. Hummel
Philosophy	Arthur E. Murphy
Physics	P. W. Bridgman
Psychiatry	George S. Stevenson
Psychology	Otto Klineberg
Radio	Lewis H. Titterton
Sociology	R. M. MacIver
Theater	Joseph Wood Krutch

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR

VOLUME 12 *Autumn 1943* NUMBER 4

Editorial

Harlow Shapley

WILD OLIVES, and puff-adders in the rocky ledges are nature's grim contributions to a Kopje on the Modder River in the Orange Free State where man's contributions include ten telescopes and the memory of an expatriated Scot. Not so long ago the Kopje was merely a forbidding hill on the lonesome Veldt, but now it is "farthest south" in Harvard Yard — and still rather forbidding. The memory of that Scot will be crystallized one of these days, health and wars permitting, by General Jan Christiaan Smuts, whose calm work in a nervous world is described sympathetically in Mr. Moolman's essay. For it is the plan of this greatest of Boers, the Prime Minister of South Africa, to stop off some time at Harvard Kopje, on his way from the Transvaal to Cape Town, in order to dedicate formally a room in Harvard's South African Observatory to the memory of his old friend, Alexander Roberts, whose world-wide fame as an observer of stars was more than equalled by his South African renown as the friend of the black man. In that room (this writer's South African office!) he will find the scientific library of the great amateur, and the original records of his thousands of measures on southern variable stars, made during the clear South African nights as an antidote to the daytime strain of teaching the natives and planning their future. But the visit to the Observatory will not be wholly out of respect for the memory of Dr. Roberts; General Smuts is also a friend of the stars, a patron of scientific research, a reader, thinker, and writer, on cosmic themes.

To his country and his countrymen, Smuts plays a role similar to that enacted in young America by Thomas Jefferson one hundred and fifty years ago, excelling the Virginian, however, in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

simplicity of his tastes and private life, and in his prowess as a practical military leader. Both of these statesman-farmers had the capacity of becoming important scientists, perhaps leading scientists of their times and their countries. But public duties interfered. Nevertheless, Jefferson was for some years president of the scholarly American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia; and Smuts in 1929 was president of the great British Association for the Advancement of Science. Jefferson had to turn from his plantation and his instinctive interest in many scientific pursuits to the writing of our Declaration of Independence, to the representing of the Colonies in France, to the founding of the patent system, and to the Presidency of the United States. A pity he could not have been spared to the full development of his scholarship! And General Smuts, one of the great men of our era, has had to sacrifice his botany, his mountaineering, his penetrating pre-Freudian analysis of the life and writings of Walt Whitman, and his deep concern with the philosophical systems based on modern physical and biological science, in order to mould the political destiny of his people during four decades, and to stand with Woodrow Wilson and other great idealists in the attempt to create a rational inter-nation.

But ever since those heroic days, forty-five years ago, when the Cambridge-trained scholar, the studious young attorney, transformed himself into the hard-riding leader of the original commandos and fought futilely for South African independence, Jan Smuts has had to deal with heterogeneity in race, language, religion, and political ambitions. The Kimberly diamonds and the Johannesburg gold have been political and social curses mixed with uncertain economic blessings. Four blacks for every white, impossible trade balances, stubborn nationalists, bi-lingual schools, courts, and parliaments — the handling of these situations has required a cool wise man of strong character and unflinching courage.

Our regret, however, must be not that "die Oubaas" has been thwarted from a full life of science and scholarship, but that he has not had for his assignment the management and encouragement of a still greater nation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Jan Christiaan Smuts and the Union of South Africa

Henry M. Moolman

THIS article is penned in the reasonable hope that by the time it appears in print Field Marshal Jan Christiaan Smuts, Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, will not be long in coming to the United States. His visit has been anticipated for some considerable time. He had President Roosevelt's invitation in 1942 to visit the United States, and there was some hope when he visited London in October last year that it would also be possible to welcome him in Washington. But as the man in charge of the South African Ship of State, Smuts cannot absent himself from the bridge too long.

The history of his adult life and of his role in politics and statesmanship is in a great many respects that of South Africa for more than forty years. It has been especially so during the turbulent days of World War II. For the outside world, since September 4, 1939, Smuts has spelt South Africa. To know Smuts today is to know the Union of South Africa. When he speaks his voice is heard far beyond the borders of his own country; his own history is the story of one of the most fascinating periods in the history of his country.

Smuts is now seventy-three, and is the last surviving member still in active office of the band of statesmen who wound up World War I at Paris and Versailles in 1919. He was a great figure then, and he has not lost in stature during the difficult intervening years, which have seen the eclipse of so many other reputations. Now, as then, he is still as much the soldier as he is the statesman. He is also the Union's Minister of Defence and Commander-in-Chief of the Southern African Command, which includes the forces of the Union's British neighbor, Southern Rhodesia. He has repeatedly visited the front in East and North

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Africa and his words, as in 1917–18, carry the same weight in the councils of the British High Command. He has conferred with Churchill in North Africa and has exchanged views with the British Cabinet in London. South Africa's late Governor-General, Sir Patrick Duncan, once described Smuts as "a great rock in a weary world." He has also made his country, occupying an exceptionally vital place in the general strategic plan in World War II, one of the solid bastions in the United Nations front.

Smuts occupies a leading place in the world, but he is especially interesting because of his place in the British Commonwealth of Nations. More than any other person, his words and actions explain this strange partnership of nations held together by nothing more tangible than their mutual love of freedom and their respect for common obligations and the decencies of international relationships. Smuts has not a drop of British blood in him. His country is as free as the United States and the United Kingdom. It was free to enter this war or to stay out of it if it desired to do so. It chose to enter the war to safeguard its heritage as a free and freedom-loving people.

Many people who are not acquainted with South Africa's history point wonderingly at the fact that a Boer leader, who fought the British in the Anglo-Boer War of 1899–1902, is now one of the key-men in the British Commonwealth partnership. But cooperation between the Boers (the Dutch) and the British in South Africa is something almost as old as the history of civilized South Africa. It was seen in the eighteenth century when the Dutch East India Company held the Cape as the half-way house for ships plying between the West and the East. It was seen throughout the nineteenth century when Dutch and British Colonists shared in the administration of the Cape and stood side by side in the long series of frontier wars against the Bantu tribes. The will to cooperate was demonstrated particularly during the latter half of the last century when repeated attempts were made on both sides to bring about some form of federation between the two British Colonies, the Cape and Natal, and the two Dutch Republics, the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. The vision of a united South African nationhood was seen per-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

haps a century ago. Since then South Africa has gone through the crucible of war and civil strife and sometimes of bitter racial feeling, but the vision is still there and the South Africans, whether they are Dutch or English, say it has never been so bright as it is now.

Let us take a look first at the country which Smuts rules as Prime Minister and then at Smuts himself. The Union, at the southernmost end of the African Continent, is less than half a million square miles in area, or roughly one-sixth the size of the United States. Its European (white) population numbers slightly less than 2¼ million, and its non-European population, comprised mainly of the black Bantu races, numbers about eight million. It is not generally realized that though the Union's white population is so small it is the largest settled white community on the whole of the African Continent. Smuts often reminds South Africa of this fact and of her responsibilities to her neighbors in the sub-continent, and already there have been important and far-reaching developments in communications, trade, health, and veterinary services between the Union and many other states in Southern Africa. Smuts believes that the experiences of scores of thousands of South African soldiers who have traversed the length of the Continent to fight on the shores of the Mediterranean will immeasurably broaden South Africa's own outlook towards the affairs of the other states in Africa and promote co-operation in the sub-continent as never before.

Of the Union's 2¼ million white population nearly two-thirds are mainly of Dutch and French Huguenot descent and the remainder mainly of British descent. The people of the Union describe themselves as South Africans or, to indicate their racial origin if necessary, as Afrikaans-speaking South Africans and English-speaking South Africans. For the most part they have buried the bones of old racial feuds and team together as one of the most virile and self-reliant peoples to be found anywhere on the globe. What friction there is is usually a healthy process of rubbing off the corners. South Africa has always emerged stronger from her trials.

And so, too, in the long run, has Smuts. At the threshold of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his career, as State Attorney to President Paul Kruger in the Transvaal Republic, the outbreak of the Anglo-Boer War drove him from his desk into the field. He returned three years later, toughened and hardened by his commando life on the veld, enriched by a remarkable stamina which has helped him surmount more years of storm and stress than the average man can reasonably carry. Out of the bitterness of the postwar years Smuts helped to hasten the grant of responsible government to the ex-Republics. Responsible government became a stepping stone to the Union in 1910 of the Transvaal, Free State, Cape, and Natal. Losing no time in vain regrets over the lost republican independence of the Transvaal and Free State, Smuts labored mightily to create something bigger and freer. He has made mistakes and he has had grievous setbacks, but he has consistently followed the goal of a united South Africa, respected by the world and upholding her obligations to her friends. Today, when South Africa has extended to the utmost her resources in manpower and material in the cause of the United Nations, he says: "There is no blot on our sovereign independence. We acted as a free and honourable people. Dishonour and sovereignty do not go well together."

When Smuts signed the Versailles Treaty in 1919 — under protest, because he saw in it the seeds of another war — he was already a figure of almost legendary achievement. He had helped to conquer South West Africa from the Germans; he had commanded the British and South African forces in East Africa in 1916–17 and broken the grip of that redoubtable German commander, von Lettow Vorbeck; he had been a member of the British War Cabinet and had been entrusted with missions of the greatest delicacy and importance. He had planned the defense of London and fathered the organization of the Royal Air Force; he had taken a leading part in the creation of the League of Nations. He was asked to remain in Europe and offered the choice of distinguished posts. He chose to return to South Africa where, within a few weeks of his arrival, he became Prime Minister when his leader, General Louis Botha, died.

He came back to a difficult and thankless task. Under the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leadership of General James Barry Munnik Hertzog, Afrikaner nationalism had made considerable strides during the war years; Hertzog himself had visited Paris with a delegation during the Peace Conference to ask for the restoration of the two Republics. Hertzog's Nationalist Party advocated secession from the Empire and had reached a stage where it could contemplate ousting Smuts's South African Party from power.

The South African Party counted the support of both Afrikaans- and English-speaking South Africans, but it made heavy weather during Smuts's first Premiership. There were industrial troubles and disturbances that created irritation against the Government. Smuts's iron-handed methods in settling the great strike on the goldfields in 1922 especially antagonized the Labor Party which made common cause with the Nationalist Party in the 1924 General Election to oust Smuts's government. Smuts himself was defeated in a Pretoria constituency by a Labor candidate, but was within a week or two returned unopposed by the Standerton constituency, in the Eastern Transvaal, vacated in his favor by a party supporter.

From being the world-renowned figure of World War I and Prime Minister of South Africa, Smuts now became in Parliament merely the "Right Hon. Member for Standerton" and Leader of the Opposition. This he was destined to remain for nine years of frustration and of bitter party political strife. He was reviled as an Imperialist. The achievements which brought him fame overseas brought him scorn and derision at home. A lesser man might not have held his ground; Smuts did, and unswervingly followed the path of racial conciliation within South Africa and of the country's continued partnership in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

During these years in opposition Smuts found leisure to follow those wider intellectual pursuits which have gained him fame also in the fields of science and philosophy. As a young man he had been a student and admirer of the American poet, Walt Whitman, and wrote a philosophical treatise on Whitman which was never published. In 1925 he expressed his philosophy in a book called "Holism and Evolution," a study of the unifying forces in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nature. In 1929 he presided at the meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, which took place at Cape Town. He delivered the Rhodes Memorial lecture at Oxford and was made honorary D.C.L. of the University. He was elected Lord Rector of St. Andrews University, Scotland, and was given the freedom of London and various other cities. He toured America and presided over the tenth anniversary meeting of the League of Nations. In 1931 he presided in London over the centenary meeting of the British Association. He has honorary degrees from more than a score of universities in England, Scotland, Ireland, the United States, Canada, and South Africa. He is a Fellow of the Royal Society and a Bencher of the Middle Temple. In 1942 he was awarded the Albert Medal of the Royal Society of Arts, a distinction which he shares with President Roosevelt.

Events have laid stronger emphasis on Smuts as a soldier and statesman than on Smuts as a scholar, philosopher, and scientist, but if it were not for his compelling preoccupation with the affairs of government, his contributions to science and philosophy alone may well have brought him renown.

The British Commonwealth ideal expressed by Smuts as far back as 1917 became an accomplished fact during General Hertzog's Premiership, the Statute of Westminster in 1931 proclaiming the "free association of the British Commonwealth of Nations" and giving South Africa unhampered freedom of legislation in all her affairs, domestic and extra-territorial. By this time, too, it was becoming evident that there was very little in the way of national issues to keep the Nationalist and the South African Parties apart. The great depression which overtook South Africa, in common with the rest of the world, weakened Hertzog's government, and the need for a coalition government to pull the country through the crisis became more and more apparent. Such a coalition was formed in 1932, Smuts and Hertzog thereby closing a classic political duel that had lasted for twenty years. Coalition rapidly developed into the complete fusion of the two parties, the great majority of the members from each now becoming associated in the United South African Na-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional Party with General Hertzog as Prime Minister and General Smuts as Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Justice. It was said at the time that Smuts and his South African Party could have carried the day in a general election and that he could have become Prime Minister; he, however, adopted the course which promised the country the best chances of recovery and of freedom from political strife.

One issue remained, however, which was destined once more to split South Africa into two clear-cut political camps; and that was the issue whether, if Britain became involved in a war, South Africa would participate in that war. On this issue General Hertzog and General Smuts had agreed to differ when they joined forces in 1933. General Hertzog stood for a policy of neutrality for South Africa in any war in which the country itself was not directly threatened. General Smuts, while himself affirming South Africa's complete autonomy — a right to declare herself neutral if she wished to do so — held that any threat to the safety of Britain was a threat to the safety and freedom of South Africa.

When war broke out on September 3, 1939, General Hertzog proposed that Parliament should declare itself for a policy of benevolent neutrality. An immediate Cabinet crisis arose, and on the issue being tested in the House of Assembly General Smuts carried by 80 votes to 67 his amendment that relations be severed with Germany. He was called upon to form a new government, which he did with the aid of the small Dominion and Labor Parties, and war was formally declared on Germany on September sixth.

After fifteen years Smuts was once again Prime Minister of South Africa, with the backing not only of the English-speaking section in South Africa, but also in a very great measure of the Afrikaans-speaking section who see no freedom in the future for South Africa in a Nazi-ridden world.

Smuts also became Commander-in-Chief of the South African forces. He faced a colossal task. Not only was the country almost totally unprepared for war so far as trained manpower was concerned, but also her industries were not geared for wartime production.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The country had become a happy hunting ground for Nazi agents financed from Germany, and among his own people Smuts faced a strong isolationist sentiment which inevitably embarrassed the Government in the prosecution of the country's war effort. Smuts stamped out Hitler's spy cells in the Union and interned a number of people who, if left at large, might have become active fifth-columnists. In Parliament he handled his opposition with tact and patience and slowly built up a sound working majority in the House of Assembly, which enabled him to get on with the war without much distraction from the political front.

Political dissension within the opposition camp itself contributed in no small measure to his strong position. As time passed and the people of the Union devoted themselves to an all-out war effort which placed South Africa in the front rank of the fighting democracies, Smuts's followers claimed with justice that his comparatively narrow majority in Parliament did not reflect the sentiments of the country. These sentiments were tested in the General Election of July, 1943, which in a House of 150 members, gave Smuts's United Party alone a clear majority of 28 over all other parties, the total pro-war majority in Parliament, including the Dominion and Labour Parties, being 64 — a remarkable step-up from the 13 majority of September, 1939. Death has removed General Hertzog from the scene and the leader of the anti-war Reunited Nationalist Party today is Dr. Daniel François Malan.

What South Africa has done in this war under Smuts's guidance is a story that cannot fully be told here. She has sent only volunteers into the field, and yet nearly 10 per cent of her white population are in the fighting services. She has played a great part in keeping the Cape sea lanes open for Allied shipping. Her troops went to Madagascar and helped to rout Mussolini in East Africa. They fought in North Africa, helped to check Rommel at El Alamein and to push him back on his long retreat to Tunisia. In all the African theaters of war the South African Air Force won for itself imperishable renown. Smuts himself points out that the South African Air Force dropped the first and last bombs against enemy targets in Africa, the first in East Africa on June

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

11, 1940, the last on Cape Bon. After that the S.A.A.F. operated over Sicily and far afield over Italy. The ban on South African troops serving outside the African Continent was removed early in 1943, and Rommel was still running for Tunisia when it was announced that the first of South Africa's new armored divisions for overseas service had arrived in North Africa. In repairs, manufactures, and other wartime industries the Union has made incalculable contributions to the United Nations' war effort. Smuts is proud of what his country has done, and South Africa is proud of him.

Smuts was appointed a Field Marshal on his seventy-first birthday on May 24, 1941. Characteristically, he accepted his baton not as a personal distinction but as a great honor shown to his country. He prefers to be addressed as "General" rather than Field Marshal, and to hundreds of thousands of South Africans he is simply "the General," or, more affectionately still, "die Oubaas" (the Old Chief). His troops call him "die Oubaas" and he calls them "my seuns" (my sons). Equally beloved is Mrs. "Isie" Smuts, who is almost as remarkable a person as her distinguished husband. As Chairwoman of the South African Gifts and Comforts Fund, this curly-headed, seemingly frail little old lady has repeatedly flown in bombers to East and North Africa to see how "my boys and girls" are getting on (the girls being members of the South African Women's Auxiliary Corps). They call her "Ouma" (grandmother) and dote on her.

The Smutses have magnificent official residences in Cape Town and Pretoria, but whenever official duties permit they prefer the simple life of their farm "Doornkloof," near Pretoria. The house is a wood and iron structure which Smuts purchased forty years ago after it had served its purpose as a club for British soldiers in the Anglo-Boer War. In it he has one of the most remarkable private libraries in the world and signed photographs of many notable people who have visited his unpretentious home and enjoyed the Smutses' simple Boer hospitality.

Smuts, soldier, statesman, philosopher, and scientist, the associate of the great men of the world, is happiest here as Farmer Smuts. Comfortably dressed in slacks and open-necked shirt,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with staff in hand, he strides with prodigious energy across the veld. He is a keen botanist and an expert on grasses. His favorite relaxation, when he can afford the time, is to fill a car with camping kit, with a native "boy" to cook for him, and to disappear "into the blue" on a botanizing expedition. He is a keen mountaineer and often climbs the 3,500-foot Table Mountain — a stiff task for men half his age. After one particularly trying crisis in South African affairs he is reported to have said: "I was so tired that I could only climb Table Mountain!"

He was a seemingly cold and aloof person in his youth and prime and not readily approachable. Few people shared his full confidence. Today he is a more mellowed personality, rejoicing in a family life which is a model to his people, and especially in the companionship of a growing brood of grandchildren. At seventy-three he retains the supple bearing of a young man, a tireless capacity for work, and a whipcord resistance to fatigue. He has mellowed — but it is still wise to approach him with circumspection. His eyes, as of old, still flash cold blue steel.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fundamentals of Peace

Hans Kohn

IT MAY be premature to draw a blueprint for the peace treaties and for the world after this war. Discussion of details at the present time may not only create and emphasize differences of opinion and thus weaken the necessary united effort for victory, but may also obscure the essential basis of peace by overemphasis upon incidental matters. We must disentangle the fundamentals from the accidental elements in the coming peace, and concentrate upon those fundamentals. Details of the peace will inevitably be shaped by events of the war and by sacrifices in blood and toil which each partner in victory contributes to the common goal. Yet victory as a goal in itself should not be belittled, for victory alone will be a tremendous achievement. It will mean the greatest prize which a nation can gain — survival in freedom, which seemed uncertain enough in the tragic year 1940, and which cannot be achieved without the complete concentration of the United Nations upon it.

Victory alone is worth any price; it will be a cause for the most grateful rejoicing. Churchill's greatness as a leader in this crisis of mankind was never more clearly shown than by his refusal to appeal to his people with easy promises of gain and happiness, and by his constant and solemn insistence upon arousing his people to an understanding of the dignity of their survival as free men through victory. Victory will offer the opportunity for building an international order of law and peace. The fundamental conditions of a lasting peace will become clear when we understand why the victors of 1918 missed their opportunity. Nothing is more misleading than the tendency to attribute that failure to the peace treaty of Versailles, to capitalism, to the economic plight of "have-nots," to emphasis on national self-determination, or to other causes which, since 1919, have been adduced by German propaganda in justification of its plans. All these issues

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tend only to distract attention from the real reasons why the peace treaty of 1919 — in many ways a most promising and just settlement — failed.

Yet in 1918 the birth of a better world seemed assured. America reaped the fruits of victory. She had entered the war in 1917 for a good and sufficient reason: once in control of Europe and the Atlantic, German arrogant militarism would have menaced America's security and freedom. In 1918 the combined efforts of the Western powers had removed this threat. This happy result alone would have been worth any sacrifice and price to Americans. But the promise held out was even greater: as the triumph of Bismarck in 1871 had strengthened the forces of militarism and aggressive nationalism everywhere, so the victory of the democracies everywhere strengthened the forces of liberty and peace. Even a cursory glance at the world which emerged through that victory shows the first World War as one of the greatest democratizing and liberating forces in history. For a century the three Eastern empires, united in 1815 in the Holy Alliance, had formed the mightiest bulwark of reaction, and had fought a tenacious fight against all forces of liberty and democracy. In 1918 the dynasties of the Hohenzollern, Habsburg, and Romanov had fallen; in their place republics had risen, and the most daring hopes of the generation of 1848 seemed fulfilled. Oppressed nationalities had been liberated, social and political gains, beyond the dreams of nineteenth century democrats, had been achieved, dormant people all over the earth had awakened from their age-old lethargy to demand their share in the rights and dignity of man.

Soon, however, these fair prospects of a better world were dimmed. Authoritarian militarism, so characteristic of Bismarckian Germany, raised its head in even uglier forms, false prophets proclaimed the doom of liberalism and democracy, even of Western civilization and of all "humanitarian sentimentalism," and the hard-won fruit of victory — security against the threat of aggression — turned bitter. Within twenty years Germany was again on the march to establish her domination over all the lands from the North Sea to the Mediterranean and Caspian Seas as the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

basis for world hegemony. America was again forced to fight in self-defense. In his memorable speeches on his Western tour in September 1919 Woodrow Wilson had predicted that outcome "with absolute certainty," should the Treaty of Versailles not be enforced and should America reject the League of Nations. He proved a true prophet. The peace of 1919 had in many ways pointed in the right direction which we have to follow: collective security, concern for social justice and humane conditions of labor, disarmament of the aggressors, reparations for damage and loot, punishment for inhumanities. But in 1919 their formulation was not thoroughly thought out, not tight enough, and therefore ineffective. Above all, the peace was marred from the beginning by two fundamental mistakes which made its enforcement impossible and thus destroyed it and brought about the resumption of the war. These two fundamental mistakes we must avoid.

The first was a premature armistice, concluded with the German armies still deep in the enemy's land, while no allied soldier was on German soil. Their army still intact, the Germans were allowed to believe that they had not been defeated on the battlefield, but had been tricked into the Armistice by Wilson's promises, which, it was alleged, were not kept, and had been stabbed in the back by the treachery of unreliable elements on the home front. Leading Germans never acknowledged real defeat and regarded the peace treaty as unjust because imposed upon an undefeated nation. The faith in the invincibility of their army survived as the norm and center of all German life. The incubus of Prussian militarism on the German mind was not broken. Germany grew ready to resume the struggle, better prepared and more solidified by an unshakable faith in her world mission and her superiority. The German hopes were fostered by the non-enforcement of Germany's disarmament, which played into the hands of the German militarists and weakened the influence of the small but gallant group of devoted friends of peace and liberty in Germany who struggled in vain to stem the tide of German militarism.

The second mistake was the victors' refusal to cooperate in enforcing the peace and solving the central problem of the se-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

curity of France and of the small nations. The French knew that the already tremendous numerical and industrial superiority of Germany was steadily growing. Having been invaded and devastated twice within a generation, the French demanded security by the creation of a Rhineland buffer state. When, secure behind their Maginot lines of water, Wilson and Lloyd George refused the French demand, Clemenceau was ready in his desire for compromise to abandon the Rhineland, against Foch's advice, and to stake France's future on his faith in the Anglo-Saxons. He accepted Wilson's and Lloyd George's offer of a treaty in which America and Britain pledged themselves to come immediately to the aid of France in case of an unprovoked German attack. Solemn treaties to that intent were signed by the official spokesmen of the two Anglo-Saxon nations. But they were never ratified, the promises never honored, and France, left without security, spent the following years in a frantic search for it. When the search failed, a deep defeatism took hold of the French soul and prepared it for the tragic disaster of 1940.

The Germans had been molded for decades by the universal education of the schools and army in unquestioning obedience to state and authority, in glorification of war and discipline, and in arrogant pride in their nation's superiority. Lacking and despising the homely virtue of common sense, they rationalized their national urges in high-sounding philosophy which in their denunciation of democracy and western rationalism impressed even many Americans and Britishers. While France disarmed materially and psychologically, as had Britain and America, Germany rearmed. The non-payment of reparations enabled her to gain far greater industrial strength than she had shown in 1914. By a supreme irony, liberals in Britain and America were obsessed by a deep distrust of alleged French militarism and lust for domination, and by a profound sympathy with a Germany allegedly weak and insecure. That the French army was the bulwark of Western civilization became painfully clear to many intelligent men and women only in June 1940. Its breakdown put the Anglo-Saxon nations and all liberty into mortal peril.

Disunity among the former allied victors, and their mutual

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

distrust, served to make a German triumph only too possible. Had the four empires of the United States, Britain, France, and Russia stood together, peace and the progress of liberty would have been maintained. Not only were they disunited; they rationalized their disunity by all kinds of myths about the nature of war and the Treaty of Versailles. As a result, German propaganda achieved its greatest triumph; the distress of the Germans was emphasized; consequences to her neighbors and victims were overlooked. The world was constantly reminded that disarmament (which in the long run is the indispensable condition for any change of heart in the German people) might cause a sense of frustration in Germany, while in reality German armament could not only frustrate but destroy Germany's neighbors. The whole moral confusion of the long armistice expressed itself in warm sympathy for, and optimistic confidence in, the good nature of the aggressor, and distrust and dislike of the victim.

Thus a premature armistice and disunity among the victors wrecked the peace after 1918. Solemn official declarations justify the hope that that original mistake will be avoided this time. No promises will be made; unconditional surrender, complete demilitarization, and occupation of enemy territory are generally agreed upon. Thus alone can the military traditions and leadership be discredited in Germany. If that occurs, the German people will find new standards of values and new national symbols in more democratic and humane norms and, liberated from militarism and faith in superiority, may take their place among the great nations of the earth. This will be equally true of the Japanese, for there is a remarkable similarity in the development and aspirations of Prussia and Japan. Mr. Otto Tolischus, who has had an excellent opportunity of observing both nations, sums up his impressions:

> On a slightly different foundation, but with the same intent, the same arguments, and from the same historic urge for conquest, Japan, like Nazi Germany, was mapping out a program which, if realized, would permit her to pre-empt an entire continent for her own exclusive exploitation, would make its teeming millions, comprising half the human race, drawers of water and hewers of wood for the Japanese master

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

race, and would ultimately enable her, after expelling all other influences from this sphere, to organize it as a base for the conquest of the world.

More important than Germany's and Japan's disarmament for the preservation of peace will be the continuing unity and strength of the United Nations. This alone can encourage the German and Japanese liberals in their struggle against the deep-rooted national traditions of militarism. For without unity among the victors, Germany and Japan will again begin to play off one group of victors against the other, to reestablish their military power and defeat any attempts at their education for democracy. The United Nations, by maintaining a strong united stand, can remove any hope of successful aggression; if so, Germans and Japanese will finally abandon all hopes and dreams of military reassertion and become willing and welcome partners in the community of nations. Thus alone a lasting peace can follow upon our total victory.

Here a word of warning should be sounded. If disillusionment and frustration are to be avoided, no "perfect" peace should be expected to solve problems which no peace treaty, taking into account the many conflicting interests and interpretations of "perfection," can ever solve. We cannot start, as so many suggest, by removing the "causes" of war. There is no agreement about these causes; they are of utmost complexity and vary from case to case. For instance, it is widely believed that poverty, the "have-not" quality, is responsible for war. But Germany was immensely rich and prosperous in 1914, unhampered by any memories of defeat; she possessed colonies and was growing in trade. At the same time Russia was at the peak of prosperity, in command of vast and undeveloped territories. Whether we consider Germany or Russia or both primarily responsible for the outbreak of the war in 1914, neither was motivated by poverty. On the other hand, trade rivalry between Great Britain and the United States had been intense, yet it has not led to war. It is a naïve belief that an economically prosperous country is necessarily a satisfied one, or that business interests are eager for war. Motives for war should be sought rather in dominant political ideas and temper

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than in economics. But whatever the causes of war (and they are different in every historical circumstance) we fortunately need not wait for their analysis and removal to establish peace.

We are painfully conscious that mankind suffers from many moral and economic ills, from many forms of social and racial oppression. But no peace treaties can establish economic justice or moral perfection, nor can they wait for such "perfection." Peace can create favorable conditions for social progress and spiritual life; it does not depend upon them, but upon the enforcement of law by the united force of law-abiding nations. We established law and peace nationally, without waiting for the removal of all the causes of crime or disorder or for economic justice and moral perfection. Injustice and exploitation have remained with us nationally even after the establishment of law and peace. The steadfast fight against them has gone on for many generations and must continue for many generations to come. But as preceding generations have succeeded (by a frame-work of peace under law) in regulating and inspiring the continuous national struggle for greater freedom and justice, with its concomitant conflicts and tensions, so this generation can create a similar frame-work internationally by collective responsibility for an enforcement of peace by the United Nations. The United Nations now include representatives of all climates and all races — China and Mexico, France and Norway, Iraq and Ethiopia — and will, in a not too distant future, include *all* nations. To that end we must direct our attention to the central point of enforcing law, instead of to incidental, though in themselves desirable, objectives, which no peace treaty can achieve.

Peace by collective action is the task before the United Nations. Their organization, as it evolves during the war, must be held together by a strong nucleus of great powers upon which rests the primary responsibility for world peace. They alone have the power — and power carries an obligation not to negate or belittle it, but to use it for the common good. In the present condition of the world, three great powers, Britain, Russia, and the United States, form the indispensable minimum of this nucleus, to which the French and Chinese Empires would form the nearest

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

associates in responsibility. If they cooperate, they are strong enough to maintain peace; yet they are so different in their interests and purposes that they cannot abuse their combined power. If they fail to cooperate, there will be war. None of them is strong enough to impose its will or ideas upon the others. It would be dangerous if one of them tried. In 1940 the Axis triumphantly expected the liquidation of the British Empire; in 1941 the end of the Russian Empire. But both are stronger now than before the war.

The British Empire stood, when Hitler and all his friends proclaimed its liquidation, as the lonely and glorious bulwark of freedom in the critical days of 1940 and saved the world from fascist domination by its deep-rooted traditions of liberty and its unique moral strength. It was not the British people alone on the small island close to Europe who performed that already almost legendary task. They did it only through the indispensable support of the whole British Empire and of its strategic bases all over the world. In the crucial months of 1940, when Mussolini had entered the war to crush Egypt between his armies of Libya and Ethiopia and to help liquidate the British Empire, and when Pétain's France had betrayed the cause of democracy and left the British ally alone to defend the world and France, a small band of British imperial troops on the Suez Canal, supported by the power of Gibraltar and Malta, Aden and Trincomalee, saved the pivotal hub of the Old World for the cause of liberty and humanity and prevented the consolidation of Europe, Africa, and Asia under the Axis. The British Empire might then have easily disintegrated: it stood the supreme test under Churchill's magnificent leadership better than even its most faithful friends had expected. Mussolini's Empire, historically the leader of fascism and so boastfully announced to the world, fell to pieces with astonishing ease under slight pressure. The British Empire, which has been the cradle of parliamentary democracy and has set the world the example of a community of different peoples held together by a system of unparalleled flexibility and by an uninterrupted growth of liberty and respect for law, will emerge from the strain of this war in new strength, rejuvenated at its center and in all its parts, the model nucleus of a wider association of nations.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The same is true of the Soviet Union. The events of 1941, the battles for Moscow and Stalingrad, have proved that the ruthless process of the revolution has released the creative abilities of the Russian masses and awakened them from age-old lethargy to unexpected national vigor. Stalin has, apparently with greater success, carried on and consolidated the great building of empire begun by Ivan IV and Peter I, whose names resound again today throughout the vast Empire, but now an empire deeply rooted in the consciousness of the masses and resuming its historical urge towards the Baltic and Pacific seas. Out of the crucible of unprecedented suffering, inflicted by the German invaders upon the Russian people, a new nation is being born, waging a total war for its national liberation and conscious of its new strength and historical mission. In spite of their differences in attitude — the one based on a unique tradition of liberty and individual dignity, the other of authority and community — the British and the Soviet Empires have found the way to mutual collaboration in the interests of peace. Their treaty of May 26, 1942 set the model for the postwar world. The United States must join them in creating a steadfast concert for peace.

In a newly aroused imperialism, some Americans today overrate the strength of the United States and wish it alone to run the world. They cloak this imperialism sometimes with benevolent slogans and an easy idealism. Some wish to liquidate other empires, to substitute American leadership for them. Some wish to acquire additional imperial bases all over the world. They may be right in their belief that the Americans are the best, most unselfish, and most efficient people on earth and thus, in the interest of mankind, qualified and destined to guide it. Unfortunately, the people of Europe, Russia, or Ibero-America are too benighted to understand this point of view. There is a danger, lest, in view of this ingratitude, some of those Americans who are perturbed at the imperfections of others, will threaten to withdraw into isolation and to leave the evil world to itself. They apparently proceed upon the belief that we are in the war because, responding to our naturally generous impulses, we wished to save the British or other empires. In reality we are in this war for our own survival,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as are the British and all the other peoples. In our interest and in theirs, we have helped Great Britain, Russia, and China; yet it is a question whether, in their interest as well as in ours, they have not helped us still more. They need us, we need them. They cannot withdraw if we do something which they dislike, nor can we withdraw if they act not to our liking. We can win this war only as United Nations. Even more truly the peace can be won only by United Nations. To maintain peace, in the interests and with the help of all United Nations, the great nuclear imperial powers must be strong and use their strength in union against all aggressors.

For that purpose the United States cannot abandon its imperial bases on the Panama Canal, in Puerto Rico and in Cuba, in Alaska and in the wide Pacific. In this war the United States has gained many additional bases from Great Britain on the Atlantic Ocean and in the Caribbean Sea. As the result of this war it will gain new imperial outposts in the Pacific, probably many of the Japanese mandated islands, while others may go to the British or Chinese Empires. But as we wish to keep our military outposts, to increase their number, and acquire new ones after the war, the British Empire must guard its bases and the Soviet Union adjust her frontiers according to the needs of her security, in the interest of their strength and of the security of all.

There is much feeling of distrust in this country of Great Britain and the Soviet Union. There may be even greater distrust of America in those countries, especially when some Americans proclaim that we must later fight Soviet Russia, or that we must follow the Axis design of liquidating and, at least indirectly, inheriting the British Empire. Such talk is dangerous to the cause of peace. We reject British or Soviet interference in our affairs. The Russians should have no reason to fear that we wish to impose our democracy upon them. They must evolve their life according to their own pattern in which the English concepts of individual liberty and dignity, the foundation of our own political tradition, are entirely missing. Nor should the British or other allies fear that we wish to run their affairs or their Empires or even, an unprecedented case in modern history, try to weaken and to dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

integrate an ally. The British Empire will continue to develop in spreading liberty under law and in promoting its growth, slowly, but steadily and without any retrogression. We do not like many things done in England or in the Empire — sometimes merely by ignoring the facts of the situation or the changes of time — and we do not refrain from proclaiming it loudly, but it may be that the British (though they are much more discreet) do not completely admire our solution of the racial problem and the color bar and the poverty in the South or in Puerto Rico.

But why look so far for cases of distrust? There are Americans who distrust their own administration more violently than they distrust even foreigners. Whatever our dislikes, we have to control them and to build a world of peace with the existing realities. We cannot wait until the United States, the British Empire, and the Soviet Union have achieved governments and institutions which each of us would think good. Unfortunately, we might have to wait forever. Peace cannot wait forever. The present governments and policies of the United States, of the British Empire, and of the Soviet Union are probably not ideal and many of us object to them for different and often contrary reasons, but they are the only available corner stones upon which peace can actually be built. Peace under law was established nationally without waiting for ideal conditions. It has worked well on the whole. The same task is before us today internationally — the only alternative to lawlessness and chaos.

The strongest powers among the United Nations must cooperate among themselves and with all the other United Nations in mutual tolerance of differences without any interference in internal evolution. Only such cooperation can hope to solve the many difficult problems between Russian and Chinese imperial ambitions in Sinkiang, Mongolia, and Manchuria, and of frontiers and governments in liberated Europe. The question of the frontiers will be more easily solved. The more thought one devotes to it, the greater seems the wisdom of the frontiers drawn by the Treaty of Versailles. They may not be ideal, but any new frontier would create still more difficulties. Except for the Western Soviet border, Europe will in all probability return to the frontiers of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1937. Many of the smaller states may wish to form federations and should be encouraged to do so. It would not be right or possible to abolish states like Poland and Czechoslovakia, which are not, as some Americans believe, creations of the Treaty of Versailles, but are based upon old and important factors in the political, ethnical, and cultural reality of Europe. Nor is it true that small states threaten to upset the peace or diminish prosperity and happiness. On the contrary, the peace of the world has been threatened by great aggressive powers, not by small countries, and some of the quantitatively lesser nations of Europe were qualitatively leaders in standards of living, in social legislation, and in the intensity of cultural life. After the war they, like all other nations, should lower their tariffs. However, their custom barriers have probably dislocated international trade less than have the high tariffs of some very great powers.

More difficult will be the problems presented by the new governments in all the Axis countries and in many occupied lands. The unfortunate precedent of the American deal with fascist Vichy has clearly shown the complications which may arise if the three great United Nations do not act in complete accord in the liberated countries of Europe, and if one of them tries to impose its own solutions. Only a close understanding between the United States, Britain, and Russia can prevent civil war in Germany and France, Yugoslavia and Poland, Rumania and Greece, and can establish firm and decent governments, either in full agreement with the liberal and democratic elements of the country, or at least bent upon an education towards democracy, backed by these elements.

If the great powers remain united, the United Nations can oppose aggression wherever it is threatened, and thus create an atmosphere in which mutual distrust will dwindle and the readiness for cooperation and, later, federation will grow. Contrary to some expectations, this war has increased nationalism everywhere. Norwegians and Czechs, Poles and Dutch, French and Serbs, continue the desperate struggle against the conquerors for the sake of their oppressed nationality, not for any social or economic gains. The masses of the vast Russian Empire are inspired

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by an unprecedented patriotic fervor in their heroic struggle, by a deep love for the Russian mother soil, a rekindled devotion to national greatness and historical traditions. Only a long and assured peace can reduce this fierce wave of nationalism to proportions conducive to the common welfare of mankind. Such an atmosphere will facilitate free economic intercourse, the expansion of production and employment, the elimination of discriminatory treatment in trade, partnership in the development and management of communications, the rise of standards of living in Ibero-America, Africa, and Asia, and a greater and more universal concern for the advancement of labor, as it was so well expressed in the preamble to part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles. The organization of the United Nations will have to elaborate and to enforce a universal bill of rights, guaranteeing in the constitution of all countries and of all colonies complete equality of status for all before the law and respect for every human personality, irrespective of race or caste.

The peace treaties after this war will not by themselves solve all the many problems which face us, nor will they establish a perfect world of justice and equality. But if we defeat and disarm Germany and Japan completely, and if the three strongest powers remain united as the indispensable nucleus of the United Nations, then the peace will enable China to modernize her national structure, Brazil to develop her natural resources, France to resume her great traditions of liberty, equality and fraternity, and all nations in every part of the globe to progress and prosper. In their growing strength all the United Nations will share with the present leading powers the responsibility for the enforcement of law and peace and for the improvement of human conditions everywhere. Finally, when a firm peace and a stern justice shall have convinced the Germans and Japanese of the definite failure of their far-reaching and frightful plans and shall have produced a change of their political ideas and temper, the United Nations of the world will embrace, in the rich diversity of their traditions and outlooks, all nations — grouped in imperial or regional federations — in a common world-wide partnership for mutual benefit and security.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Intellectual Criticism

Darrel Abel

I

> So the Angel said: "thy phantasy has imposed upon me, & thou oughtest to be ashamed."
>
> I answer'd: "we impose on one another, & it is but lost time to converse with you whose works are only Analytics."
>
> — *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*

THIS paper will investigate a tendency common to the work of three American critics — Allen Tate, John Crowe Ransom, and Cleanth Brooks. This tendency is their effort to define poetry as intellectual exercise and to deny that its value consists in its appeal to the feelings. Other writers appear to share their views, but because these three are typical they will be considered as representative of the whole tendency.

Their theory is novel, not because it so prizes intellect, but because it so misprizes feeling. That the purpose of poetry is to communicate states of feeling has been so universally assumed that a reasoned justification of the view has perhaps never been attempted; what everyone believes, no one needs to defend. Milton's description of poetry as "simple, sensuous, and passionate" and Wordsworth's characterization of it as "the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings" share with a thousand less well-known descriptions the assumption that feelings are the essential stuff of poetry.

This is the cause of the historic difficulty in defining poetry: It could not be significantly defined in formal terms, for what was important about it was its beginning and ending in a human sensibility. Therefore it has usually been defined by its effects, as in the following declaration by A. E. Housman:

> I think that to transfuse emotion — not to transmit thought, but to set up in the reader's sense a vibration corresponding to what was felt by the writer — is the peculiar function of poetry.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With this view compare some pronouncements of the intellectual critics:

Poetry that communicates the affective state is a fallacy of communication. (Tate)

The poetry of the feelings is not the one that the critic is compelled to prefer, especially if he can say that it taints us with subjectivism, sentimentality, and self-indulgence. (Ransom)

The intellectual critics thus repudiate emotion because they do not agree with historical opinion about the function of poetry. The difference will be made apparent by the following quotations:

Poesy . . . is an art of imitation . . . with this end, — to teach and delight. (Sidney)

The end of writing is to instruct; the end of poetry is to instruct by pleasing. (Samuel Johnson)

The proper and immediate object of poetry is the communication of immediate pleasure. (Coleridge)

Poetry recovers for us the world of whole and indefeasible objects. (Ransom)

Poetry tests with experience the illusions that our human predicament tempts us in our weakness to believe. (Tate)

The poet . . . has his particular value in his superior power to reconcile the irrelevant or apparently warring elements of experience. (Brooks)

These quotations reveal that the traditional requirement that poetry gives pleasure has been abandoned by the intellectual critics; for it they have substituted a requirement that poetry give us "complete cognition." Cognition being the purpose of poetry, poems should be intellectual displays, because the intellect is the best judge of reality; emotion is a pleasure-giving element and can be dispensed with.

The poet must be excellent in two faculties: perceiving and making. The intellectual critics hold the usual view of what poetic perception is: realizing experience with more than usual particularity, with fewer than usual blinding interpositions of conventional patterns. What the poet makes of his full and fresh per-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ceptions depends on his conception of poetry. If he thinks poetry ought to please or instruct, he will offer a pleasing or instructive interpretation of the materials of his perception. The intellectual critics condemn poetry of interpretation. If poetry wants, as Ransom says, "only to know the untechnical homely fullness of the world," and is not concerned to give us either pleasure or morality, it should reproduce the full perceptions of the poet.

The intellectual critics attack poetry of interpretation because its elements have been selected and shaped by the poet's value-judgments. In their view it is reprehensibly self-indulgent to evaluate experience, to interpret, and thereby allow emotional and subjective standards to determine the poetic construction. They say that the poet of the feelings awakens our susceptibilities with fine words and foists off on us his own convictions, instead of offering evidence and inviting our critical attention. Tate asserts:

> It is illegitimate to solicit sympathy and to arouse feeling by a sensuous exercise, and, taking advantage of the reader's awakened sympathy, to offer him a conclusion from outside the poem which will be acceptable not because of its dramatic appropriateness — indeed inevitability — but because of the reader's suggestibility.
>
> Perfect poetry . . . presents but does not interpret total experience.

The emotional agreements to which Tate objects are the only agreements of which men are capable. The imposing rational processes by which men support and explicate their views all come to rest ultimately in emotional acceptances. Appreciation of anything, of fresh bread or of the beauty of holiness, depends upon some fundamental responsive disposition of the appreciator. The poet whose dispositions are reliably typical, and who succeeds in appealing to identical dispositions in his readers without the mediation of a cumbersome argument, readily gains that acceptance which an analytic expositor gains laboriously.

The crime of wishfully interpreting experience is alleged against both romantic and idealistic poets. With a resolution most heroic the intellectual critics offer to sacrifice to their logic most of the poetry which generations of readers have agreed to prefer. Ransom disposes "a little distastefully" of Shakespeare because he "furnishes such exquisite indulgences to the feelings, and yet at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the same time so little food for the intellect." Tate, even more distastefully, disposes of Shelley and Wordsworth because they proclaim too passionately their convictions. Likewise Brooks, as Ransom approvingly notices, has been led "to make devastating slashes in the poetry of an English anthology that is now . . . rather definitely accepted."

However, Brooks is able to show a little mercy in his critical executions by finding a modicum of intellect in some romantic poetry. He discovers certain "subdued puns" and sustained subtleties in Wordsworth's "Intimations Ode" which keep it from being a piece of rank subjectivism. He saves Keats's "Ode on a Grecian Urn" from damnation as didacticism by demonstrating that the dictum "Beauty is truth, truth beauty, — that is all ye know on earth and all ye need to know" is not a dogmatic asseveration of the poet's, introduced by anticipatory rhetoric, but is a conclusion implied by the urn's beautiful, chaste, and inscrutable permanence in a world of mortal and delusive circumstance. Brooks's evaluations of the romantic poets remind us of a contemptuous remark of Tate's about Matthew Arnold, that "he admires good things for bad reasons." Brooks fails to consider that, although intellect sets up criteria, feeling applies them.

In sum, it may be said that the intellectual critics condemn all poetry which uses the poet's convictions to define experience, and which solicits emotional acceptance of the interpretation offered. What they want is a kind of viewpointless poetry, not a partial but a total representation:

> The true poetry . . . wants only to know the untechnical homely fullness of the world. (Ransom)
>
> Poetic description involves a technique of inclusion rather than of exclusion. (Brooks)
>
> Poetry proves nothing; it creates the totality of experience in its quality. (Tate)

What is the fullness, inclusion, totality which they so repeatedly stipulate as the *sine qua non* of poetry? Obviously, poetry cannot have the quantitative fullness of experience. Apparently, they mean no more by the requirement than that the poet shall see experience as complex rather than simple and shall so repre-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sent it, without evaluative selections. Even if this were desirable, it would scarcely be possible: No one can be innocent of ideas, and what a person sees depends as much on what he has in his mind as on what he has in his eye. Further, unless the poet felt impelled to make affirmations about experience he would seldom trouble to write. Contemplation may be profound knowledge, but it is inertia. Criticism, not contemplation, of life is the poet's incentive. Evaluation, the conviction that not all the elements of experience are equally valuable, produces poems. Since no one's perceptions can be total, and since the impulse to write is the impulse to evaluate, it would be more reasonable to try to get full perceptions, not by expecting individual poets to offer them, but by soliciting as many thorough and convinced interpretations as we can get. No one's vision is wide enough to comprehend all experience, and in fact the more he includes in one view the less he comprehends.

The supposition of the intellectual critics that detailed explication can more fully represent experience in all its qualities than can poetic suggestion, seems ill-founded. Suggestion is the necessary method of poetry; the elaborate analogical technique which the intellectual critics prefer does not enlarge, but limits poetic statement. A well-stated general resemblance will be accepted as just and illuminating, but if we reduce it to an enumeration of petty correspondences separately examined it becomes false and mechanical. A more serious objection to the explicitly developed figure is that it makes technique more conspicuous than the meanings which it exists to convey.

Most poets have recommended by their practice the view that over-elaboration interferes with the communication which the poet intends. Wordsworth's effectively simple comparison "Calm is all nature as a resting wheel" would be made trivial and false if it were developed into an analogy; and, worse still, such elaboration would divert the reader's attention from the qualities of the poet's experience of a fresh aspect of nature to consideration of the number of correspondences between placid nature and a wheel at rest. Only one feature is important in the comparison: the striking movelessness of something supposed to be always moving. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

figure is the most direct and concrete way of calling attention to this most striking feature of the poet's experience. If we stop to elaborate it, what has been an effective means becomes an inadequate end, and what has been a valuable insight becomes a barren *jeu d'esprit.* The poets admired by the intellectual critics afford too numerous instances of such tedious over-elaboration; for instance, Donne's "A Valediction: of weeping" is a whimsically arbitrary analogy between a lover's tear and a globe. The poet's circumstantial exploration of the conceit so engrosses the attention that the lover's expression of grief at parting, the nominal concern of the poem, seems a hollow artifice resorted to in order to give occasion for a display of technique.

It is, therefore, mistaken to maintain that more detail necessarily results in more significant expression. Suggestion is richer and fuller than statement; a poem is a heavy weight of implication resting on a thin edge of statement.

Because the intellectual critics think that the poet's personality might obtrude itself between the reader and the perceptions offered in the poem if it were not hidden behind an elaborate formal screen, they attach considerable importance to technical concerns, especially to the conceit. The effect of such devices is to cut the poet off from his readers by making the poem a "highly visible" construction which speaks for itself, not for its maker. Thus readers lose the exciting consciousness of being in communication almost immediate with hearts of alien circumstances, but hearts wonderfully the same as their own.

The poets whom the intellectual critics approve, the metaphysicals and obscure modern poets, are commended for the visibility, complexity, and detachment of their poetry, which refuses to "oversimplify experience" by sacrificing inclusiveness to evaluative selection. Their difficulty and seeming perversity are the result of their method — the obliquity of incomplete statements which qualify unstated or merely suggested predications, rather than the directness of precisely qualified assertions. They prefer the more difficult method because they regard all appearances of order as rational impositions, and believe that an obviously tentative and artificial framework does less violence to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the unorderly plenum of full experience than does a framework of plain assertion.

They consider that the modern revival of the metaphysical style has recovered an unfortunately obscured, but always vital, strand in our literary heritage:

> It is not modern poetry which is difficult; it is rather a certain kind of poetry as old, in English, . . . as the sixteenth century. . . .
>
> It has remained for our own age to discover in Donne the main stream of English verse. (Tate)
>
> Ours is the age which among other things has recovered the admirable John Donne; that is the way to identify its literary taste. (Ransom)

Brooks's entire book *Modern Poetry and the Tradition* explores the thesis that the metaphysical is the authentic tradition of English poetry, denied and discarded by a succession of brilliant hypnotists; that metaphysical poetry was in fact a splendid anticipation of the modern temper.

It is hard to understand why, in order to appreciate Donne, one must depreciate Keats, or pervert his poetry to fit a narrow intellectual definition. If the poetry fails to fit the definition, it seems wiser to reject the definition than the poetry.

II

> Here & there I saw one savourily picking the flesh off his own tail. — *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*

For the intellectual critics, the world of experience is not a comprehensible logos, an orderly action of embodied principles, "an army of unalterable law," but a perceptible chaos, a mighty maze without a plan. Man's desire for certainty and the delusions fostered of desire, they say, have led him to prefer factitious "heart's desire" presentments to conscientiously complex similitudes of experience.

A principal reason for the congeniality of the metaphysicals and the intellectuals is their common skepticism. Their skeptic propensity leads them, if not to a denial of values, at least to a refusal to assert any. Ransom observes that the obscure modern poets "play with a great deal of important predication without com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pleting any." Their most tentative assertions are perplexed by the shadows of many doubts. This is what *knowledge* and *cognition* mean in the vocabulary of the intellectual critics: viewing facts in such ironic relations that their implications do not agreeably contribute their forces to a common center, but instead oppose and destroy each other.

Knowledge is usually supposed to mean affirmation based on reality; the intellectual critics use it to mean negation — or, rather, abnegation, for their knowledge means renunciation of a once acceptable world of simple certainties. They think that persons who try to preserve poetry of affirmation are innocent or self-deceiving; they conceive that disillusioned knowledge is gaining upon illusioned innocence, and that few intelligent persons will be able, except by willful delusion, longer to inhabit the enchanted world of the romantics, with its passionate beliefs and vehement affirmations.

This view of the world as a panorama of casualties leads them to adopt some very Hamlet-like poses. Tate commends Donne for "rejecting the easy solutions of the human predicament." He finds that the value of poetry is that "it tests with experience the illusions that our human predicament tempts us in our weakness to believe." He finds that the common temper of Donne and the moderns is "simple awareness, complicated at the surface by the . . . resources of . . . mind, of frustration and bewilderment."

Ransom says:

> We in our strange generation . . . cannot play innocent without feeling very foolish. . . .
>
> The kind of poetry which interests us is not the act of a child . . . but the act of an adult mind; and I will add, the act of a fallen mind, since ours too are fallen.

This rejection of all but formal values, which is the fundamental habit of their criticism, might be plausibly if not conclusively explained by their Southern background, but it is more illuminating to place it in a literary perspective than in a sociological one. The critic has always been as fond of classifying as the scientist, and for the same reason: He can define the thing he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

studies only by distinguishing it from other things with opposable differences. Following classical theory, English criticism from Sidney to Arnold always affirmed that literature could be significantly divided into two classifications: one factual and utilitarian, a literature of sight, addressing itself to the intellect; the other imaginative and spiritual, a literature of insight, addressing itself to the emotions. The truths of the physical order of values were capable of rational verification; the truths of the spiritual order could be confirmed only by the strong impulse of the heart to receive them. Just as faith was acknowledged to be superior to reason, because it had cosmic and not merely earthly applications, so were intuitions of the spiritual more valuable than investigations of the material world. Therefore Dr. Johnson, more than a generation after Newton and more than a century after Bacon and Descartes, could still say confidently:

> The knowledge of external nature, and the sciences which that knowledge requires or includes, are not the great or the frequent business of the human mind.

Although he had explained Shakespeare's greatness by saying that he was "above all others the poet of nature," he meant of course human, not physical, nature. Even Francis Bacon, inductive scientist, had declared the superiority of intuition over reason:

> Poesie . . . doth raise and erect the Minde, by submitting the shewes of things to the desires of the Minde, whereas reason doth buckle and bowe the Minde unto the Nature of things.

The criticism which relied on this dual division of truth had as its characteristic procedure the rhetorical statement of assumptions about literature, rather than the analytical description of, and deduction of principles from, actual literary works. This was natural at a time when literature had no considerable body of recognized masterpieces to examine, while it was still freely experimental and unselfconscious — and while intellectual operations were less prized than intuitions.

As English critics grew more and more conscious of a glorious literary past, criticism increasingly busied itself with inducing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principles from the actual traits of existent masterpieces, emulating the practice of Aristotle and following the critical tendency of all mature literatures. In English literature this tendency reached its height about the middle of the nineteenth century, when for the first time as much attention was devoted to critical as to creative writing. By nineteenth-century critics the familiar dual classification was accommodated to the times in such terms as the literature of knowledge and the literature of power, science and poetry, sesame and lilies.

But coincident with the nineteenth-century tendency to rationalize the literary past were a growing interest in science and an increasing conviction of the adequacy of its instrument, the inductive method, in discovering truth. As materialism triumphed over idealism, conviction grew that the supposed truth of poetry and lilies was spurious, and that in fact the only truth was the lower sort offered by science and sesame. Man continued to trust his sight, and his sight so improved that he considered it the only organ of perception and denied efficacy to insight.

This drift was discerned by the critics, and Matthew Arnold's prediction that the future of poetry was immense was hopeful rather than assured. His wishful accommodation of poetry to a scientific world has never been accepted in practice. Man had realized his humanity through a long process of introspection and was beginning to realize his animality through a determined process of extrospection. This shift in the prepossession of the mass mind upset the old dual classification of knowledges by denying truth, and therefore value, to poetic intuitions. Generally speaking, most criticism since has tried to find some kind of value in poetry and lilies which will restore it to its old place of superiority to — or, at least, to equality with — science and sesame.

That is to say, most of modern criticism is a defensive activity, attempting to rationalize poetry for a world that expects its values to be ponderable. Since this is so, such criticism is in some degree misrepresentative of literature, for it is an effort to discover and explicate, not those values which belong to the poet and to sensitive men in his society whose highest sensibilities and most inarticulate predilections he utters, but rather those values which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will appeal to a special class of insensitive persons, the Gossons and Stubbses who flourish in every generation. These are a more vociferous group in our age than formerly because we have a greater percentage of literate, but not of intelligent, persons. Criticism which addresses itself to them translates into lower terms the real values of literature.

Consequently, it ought to be occasionally remarked that poetry needs to be defended from its defenders, who, in their anxiety to mollify its accusers, find value in its accidents rather than in its essence. The poker player may try to justify the game to his wife by offering her his winnings; the church-goer may justify his piety to the skeptic by representing religion as insurance; but the true poker player or religious man has no such cold-blooded utilitarian motive: Instead, he finds an intrinsic value in gambling or good works. Poetry, too, is a value in itself; just as virtue is its own reward, so beauty is its own excuse for being.

This was the perfectly valid position which the art-for-art's-sake critics took up when men, ceasing to credit that poetry was a way of deriving values from an otherwise inaccessible absolute, began to call it "ingenious fiddle-faddle." Unfortunately, the perfumed preciosity with which the art-for-art's-sake view was presented kept it from being acceptable; men who were not repelled by the argument were repelled by the exaggerated gentility of its presentation.

Intellectual criticism is a contemporary variation of art-for-art's-sake doctrine. Its expounders are cautious in acknowledging this because they are unwilling to assume the disrepute attached to the term. Tate observes carefully: "There is nothing wrong with art for art's sake if we take the phrase seriously and do not take it to mean the kind of poetry written in England forty years ago." But the intellectual way of taking it seriously is as unfortunately snobbish and as unnecessarily difficult as the earlier variety.

Poetry is still, as it has been, an imitation; no values can inhere in an artificial construction unless they are somehow imported from the outside. The poet is not a maker in the sense that he makes the values in his poem, but in the sense that he makes a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

permanent construction which holds them and makes them less elusive than they were in their free state. They are values that exposition cannot objectify nor express. Poetry cannot objectify them either, but it expresses them by subtle tangencies which imply them.

The knowledge which poetry provides is common knowledge, of things that everyone incipiently knows, or has overlooked, or forgotten. The intellectual critics mistakenly insist that poetry is a special knowledge, defined in forbiddingly formalistic terms, which most persons are unequipped to appreciate.

III

> I have always found that Angels have the vanity to speak of themselves as the only wise; this they do with a confident insolence sprouting from systematic reasoning.
>
> — *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*

The question may arise: How can these critics have confidence to declare judgments so much at variance with those maintained by generations of readers? They take some pains to argue a point that probably no one would dispute: that critics must constantly revise past judgments in order to find those elements of older works which are congenial to present dispositions, and to interpret the whole literary tradition in terms which will accommodate whatever is new.

But, though new appreciations are necessary, novelty is no assurance of improvement: The established view may be more acceptable. The intellectual critics recommend their novel views by maintaining that they are realistic and soundly traditional, as has been noticed, and further assert that intellectual poetry is better suited to the modern temper than is poetry of the feelings. They are not embarrassed by their being in a minority; they rely on the superiority of their own taste. William Hazlitt, in discussing whether it be safe to rely on so tenuous a standard as taste, decided that:

> If we were to insist on a universal standard of taste, it must be that, not which *does*, but which *would*, please universally, supposing all men to have paid an equal attention to the subject and to have an equal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relish for it, which can only be guessed at by the imperfect and yet more than casual agreement among those who have done so from choice and feeling.

There is abundant evidence that critics not inferior to the intellectuals in copiousness of reading, in analytical powers, and in delicacy and strength of feeling, exhibit more than casual agreement in preferring Shakespeare and the romantic poets to the poets extolled by the intellectual critics; if the latter rely on taste for validation of their opinions, it is obviously an eccentric, not a centric, taste.

But they have no doubt of the soundness of their own discriminations and attribute ignorance or laxness to those who differ. Tate suggests smugly:

> If we wish to understand anything, there is only the hard way; if we wish to understand Donne and Eliot, perhaps we had better begin, young, to read the classical languages, and a little later the philosophers.

Ransom explains Shakespeare's inferiority by remarking that "Shakespeare had no university discipline, and developed poetically along lines of least resistance." He explains the popularity of Shakespeare's poetry by its badness: "The cognitive experience of the participating millions must be of low grade." The same contemptuous assumption that anything capable of appreciation by common men must be low is evident in Tate, who sneers at "egalitarian superstition" and at "art that oversimplifies our experience . . . for the people." Brooks remarks fatuously that no degree of privacy in poetry ought to be objected to, because "privacy and obscurity, to some degree, are inevitable in all poetry." He suggests that, although "it is possible to prove that certain modern poets inhabit the Ivory Tower by measuring the size of the reading public which appreciates them," it would be better to say that the public is in the Ivory Tower, because of the "greater scope and breadth which the poetry of the obscure poets assimilates." It is hard to believe that the ostentatiously esoteric *pasticci* of T. S. Eliot prove him to be a widely experienced man. The intellectual critics' plea for the obscure poets seems unreasonable: They apparently solicit a more general regard for them, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the same time contemn popular opinion. It is, of course, permissible for a poet to soliloquize, but he should not feel aggrieved if people to whom he says nothing make no response.

Probably few will covet the strenuous erudition recommended by these critics if its effect is to cut us off from that community of human sympathies which supplies us with our most intense and valuable experiences. Ransom, in pointing to Shakespeare's low-grade popular poetry, was really calling attention to the poet's unique and instinctive faculty of expressing the most intense and central experiences of common humanity, a faculty which, in the opinion of Dr. Johnson — and almost everyone else — explains Shakespeare's pre-eminence:

> His persons act and speak by the influence of those general passions and principles by which all minds are agitated, and the whole system of life is continued in motion.

The traditional value of poetry is that it enables man to realize his humanity; it vivifies the world for his contemplation and makes him feel his identity with other men. Wordsworth says:

> The poet binds together by passion and knowledge the vast empire of human society, as it is spread over the whole earth, and over all time.

The cause of man's inhumanity to man, his characteristic defect, is not malevolence nor stupidity, but a torpid sensibility, an incapacity to realize the quality of another's experience. Poetry quickens man's sympathies by enabling him to occupy the sensibilities of other men. Thus he discovers congenialities which take him out of the prison of egoism into the community of mankind. Emerson observes that:

> The poet is representative. He stands among partial men for the complete man, and apprises us not of his wealth, but of the common wealth.

The common wealth which poetry calls attention to is probably something more specific than normal capacities for sensation, personal attachment, regret, fear, desire; probably there must be in acceptable poetic creation an articulation of the disposition of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

epoch in which the poet writes. The faculties of man are changeless, but his preoccupations change. Probably this change is not best described as an alternation of convention and revolt from convention, but as a continual passage from one attitude of mind to another. Thus, the characteristic concern of the Middle Ages was to define man's dependency upon God; the Renaissance had as its preoccupation the discovery of man's independent dignity and re ponsibility — not his derivative dignity as God's image, but the dignity proper to man as a competent individual; the eighteenth century considered man in society; the Romantic Period discovered nature outside man; the Victorians — for all that they rowed hard against the stream — ended with the reluctant discovery that man is a part of nature; and our own age seems to be losing, in a kind of scientific positivism, all the former concepts of religious, self-sufficient, social, natural man by losing man in his environment. The drift generally has been away from self-consciousness to self-loss in a painfully discovered material world. By degrees Man has lost his distinctness from Nature and has lapsed into being himself a natural phenomenon undistinguished except by its remarkable faculty of intellection.

This, I believe, is the melancholy tendency which the intellectual critics represent: They are a race of beings who have lost their convictions of selfhood — for self is nothing more than a distinction of man's motives from the general motives of the world outside man.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sanctuary

Nell K. A. Foster

I dreamed all mortals wielded without cease
Keen tools of plenty for the common good.
There was no greed, the kindly multitude
Forever plied the gentle arts of peace.
I wakened to reality. Mad scenes
Of savage bloodshed pass across my mind,
Knowledge in league with death, and humankind
Crushed to the earth by its own vast machines.
I must look to the ivory moon tonight
For escape and respite. Only calm and light
Reign on those hills carved on the upper air.
Upon that shining sphere none strains for wealth,
Intelligence does not destroy itself,
There is no evil, for no men are there.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Friedrich List, Forerunner of Pan-Germanism

Edward Mead Earle

"WHEN I visited the United States," wrote Friedrich List in 1841, "I cast all books aside — they would only have tended to deceive me. The best work on political economy which one can read in that modern land is actual life. There one may see wildernesses grow into rich and mighty States; and progress which requires centuries in Europe, goes on there before one's eyes. . . . That book of actual life, I have earnestly and diligently studied, and compared with my previous studies, experience, and reflections. And the result has been (as I hope) the propounding of a system which . . . is not founded upon bottomless cosmopolitanism, but on the nature of things, on the lessons of history, and on the requirements of the nations."

That *National System of Political Economy* had important influence on the development of the young United States. It is having, by a curious turn of history, perhaps even more important influence on the United States today, for the German National Socialists have made of List a patron saint, as the Pan-Germans and the expansionists did before them. Although they reject his belief in a liberal, constitutional government with adequate guarantees of individual liberty, they reverence his nationalism and his teachings, specific and general, on the interrelations of economic and military power. It was List who laid the foundations for *Lebensraum* and the *Drang nach Osten*, for the Nazi concepts of naval and colonial expansion, the impermanency of frontiers, the permanent allegiance of the *Auslanddeutsche* to the fatherland, and the desirability of a continental bloc against Anglo-American power.

Friedrich List was born in Württemberg in 1789, studied at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the University of Tübingen (where he later served briefly as professor of politics), and entered public life as an ardent exponent of the *Zollverein*. His liberal and nationalist ideas kept him in constant hot water with the reactionary government of his native state, leading finally to his exile in 1825, when he came to America and settled among the Pennsylvania Germans at Reading. He became the editor of the Reading *Adler*, a German-American weekly with an influential voice in the affairs of Pennsylvania. His interest in commercial policy soon brought him into contact with the Pennsylvania Society for the Encouragement of Manufactures and the Mechanic Arts, which was under the vigorous and able leadership of Mathew Carey, Charles Jared Ingersoll, and Pierre du Ponceau, among others. List was able to write with a wide experience of economics and politics and became the foremost literary and scholarly propagandist of protectionism during his residence in America. He was lionized by Pennsylvania industrialists, met most of the prominent American statesmen of the day, was offered the presidency of Lafayette College, and, when he finally returned to Germany in 1832, did so as a naturalized citizen and as a member of the consular service of the United States by appointment of Andrew Jackson. He was consul at Baden-Baden until 1834, at Leipzig (1834–37), and at Stuttgart (1837–45). He died by his own hand in 1846, after illness had terminated his public service.

There is reason to believe that List formulated his views on politics and economics only after his arrival in the United States. Certainly his *Outlines of American Political Economy* (a series of letters written to Charles Jared Ingersoll during the summer of 1827, subsequently printed in pamphlet form and widely distributed by the Pennsylvania protectionists) contains all the essential ideas elaborated in *The National System of Political Economy*, which appeared fourteen years later. The *Outlines* so clearly show the influence of Alexander Hamilton and Mathew Carey that there can be little reasonable doubt that American conditions and ideas were predominant, if not decisive, in the development of List's economic theories.

Nevertheless, List was first, last, and above all a German. He

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was always an unhappy exile in America and acquired American nationality partly to avoid the petty persecutions which had been his previous lot in his native land. He admired and envied the vast undeveloped resources of the United States, the youthful vigor of the country, its success in achieving political unification, the *Realpolitik* of Hamilton, the lusty nationalism of Jackson, the American enthusiasm for railways and canals, and the seemingly unlimited possibilities for the future of the United States as a world power. But all these things he related to his hopes and aspirations for his own country, then so tragically disunited. The Germany of his day might well have frustrated the determination of even a Colbert. Prussia, the dominant North German state, had more than sixty-seven different tariffs within its own territories, with almost three thousand articles subject to duties, to be collected by an army of customs officials; it had boundaries meandering almost a thousand miles through the rest of Germany, touching twenty-eight different states. Notwithstanding the seemingly insuperable difficulties, List dreamed dreams and saw visions of a new and greater Germany, unified by internal free trade, external protection, and a national system of posts and railways; and, finally, rising to the stature of a great European power. He lived to see only part of his program realized. The *Zollverein*, which destroyed more obstacles to internal commerce and political unity "than had been swept away by the political whirlwinds of the American and French Revolutions," was partly the result of his untiring efforts. His ceaseless propaganda for railways had some material results before it wore him out and hastened his death. He did not live to see the Revolutions of 1848, the successes of Bismarck, and the final creation of a German Empire. But that he is one of the makers of modern Germany has come to be more and more appreciated with the passage of time. And he is also, alas, one of the earlier exponents of that Greater Germany which has become the nightmare of the civilized world.

The primary concern of List's policies, both political and economic, was power, even though he linked power with welfare. In this respect, despite all his denials to the contrary, he was re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

verting to mercantilism. "The object of the economy of [the nation]," he wrote "is not only wealth as in individual and cosmopolitical economy, but power and wealth, because national wealth is increased and secured by national power, as national power is increased and secured by national wealth. Its leading principles are therefore not only economical, but political too. The individuals may be very wealthy; but if the nation possesses no power to protect them, it and they may lose in one day the wealth they gathered during ages, and their rights, freedom, and independence too."

Furthermore, "as power secures wealth, and wealth increases power, so are power and wealth, in equal parts, benefited by a harmonious state of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures within the limits of the country. In the absence of this harmony, a nation is never powerful or wealthy." Hence productive power is the key to national security. Mere wealth is of no avail without the "unity and power of the nation." Thus modern Germany, failing to achieve either political unification or a "vigorous and united commercial policy," was for many generations unable to maintain the position among the nations to which her civilization entitled her and was "made a convenience of (like a colony)." Germany was several times "brought to the brink of ruin by free competition with foreigners, and thereby admonished of the fact that under the present conditions of the world every great nation must seek the guarantees of its continued prosperity and independence, before all other things, in the independent and uniform development of its own powers and resources."

Tariffs and other restrictive devices designed to develop such powers and resources "are not so much the inventions of mere speculative minds, as the natural consequence of the diversity of interests, and of the strivings of nations after independence or overpowering ascendancy" — in other words, the war system. "War or the very possibility of war makes the establishment of a manufacturing power an indispensable requirement for any nation of first rank." Just as it would be the height of folly for a state to "disband its armies, destroy its fleets, and demolish its fortresses" in the modern world, so it would be ruinous for a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation to base its economic policy on an unwarranted assumption of a state of perpetual peace and world federation which exists only in the minds of the free-trade school. The ability of a nation to wage war is measured in terms of its power to produce wealth, and it is the greatest possible development of productive power which is the goal of national unification and protectionism. Protectionist policies may for a time — but only for a time — result in a lower standard of living, because tariffs necessarily involve higher prices. But those who argue that cheapness of consumers' goods is a major consideration in weighing the advantages of foreign commerce "trouble themselves but little about the power, the honour, or the glory of the nation." They must realize that the protected industries are an organic part of the German people. "And who would be consoled for the loss of an arm by knowing that he had nevertheless bought his shirts 40 per cent cheaper?"

The greater the productive power, the greater the strength of the nation in its foreign relations and the greater its independence in time of war. Hence industrialization and the achievement of a considerable measure of autarchy are essential to the development of a German national state. The present state of the nations is the result of the accumulation of all discoveries, inventions, improvements, perfections, and exertions of all generations which have lived before us; . . . and every separate nation is productive only in the proportion in which it has known how to appropriate these attainments of former generations and to increase them by its own acquirements, in which the natural capabilities of its territory, its extent and geographical position, its population and political power, have been able to develop as completely and symmetrically as possible all sources of wealth within its boundaries, and to extend its moral, intellectual, commercial, and political influence over less advanced nations and especially over the affairs of the world.

From any such beliefs it is an easy step toward a policy of territorial expansion on the continent of Europe and colonial expansion overseas, and List did not hesitate to take the step. He wanted a unified Germany to hold sway from the Rhine to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Vistula and from the Balkans to the Baltic. He believed that "a large population and an extensive territory endowed with diversified natural resources are essential requirements of normal nationality; they are the fundamentals of the spiritual structure of a people, as well as of its material development and political power. . . . A nation restricted in population and territory, especially if it has its distinctive language, can possess only a crippled literature, only crippled institutions for promoting the arts and sciences. A small state can never bring to the fullest state of development its diversified productive resources." Hence small nations will maintain their independence with the greatest difficulty and can exist only by tolerance of larger states and by alliances which involve a fundamental sacrifice of national sovereignty.

This is not very different from present-day German definitions of *Lebensraum*, as will be obvious from List's program for a Greater Germany. He advocated the inclusion in a unified Germany of Denmark, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Belgium — the first three on grounds of race and language, as well as on grounds of economics and strategy. As regards Denmark, Belgium, and the Netherlands, they were required because it was essential that Germany control the mouths of German rivers, plus the entire seacoast from the mouth of the Rhine to East Prussia, thus assuring the German nation "what it is now in need of, namely, fisheries and naval power, maritime commerce and colonies." The acquisition of these three countries, together with Switzerland, furthermore, would assure Germany the natural boundaries of seas and mountains which are essential on both economic and military grounds. Germany should likewise begin peaceful penetration of the Danubian territories and European Turkey. These areas were Germany's natural frontier, or *Hinterland*, and she had "an immeasurable interest that security and order should be firmly established" there.

A nation should "possess the power of beneficially affecting the civilisation of less advanced nations, and by means of its own surplus population and of its mental and material capital to found colonies and beget new nations." When a nation cannot

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

establish colonies, "all surplus population, mental and material means, which flows from such a nation to uncultivated countries, is lost to its own literature, civilisation, and industry, and goes to the benefit of other nationalities." This is notoriously true as regards German emigration to the United States. "What good is it if the emigrants to North America become ever so prosperous? In their personal relation they are lost forever to German nationality, and also from their material production Germany can expect only unimportant fruits. It is a pure delusion if people think that the German language can be maintained by the Germans who live in the interior of the United States, or that after a time it may be possible to establish German states there." Hence the conclusion is inescapable that Germany must have colonies of its own, in southeastern Europe and in Central and South America. And such colonies should be supported by all the resources of the nation, including state-sponsored colonization companies and "a vigorous German consular and diplomatic system."

It was England, of course, which stood in the way of German ambitions. She was the leading exponent of the balance-of-power policy which mobilized "the less powerful to impose a check on the encroachments of the more powerful." She was virtually unchallenged in her position as an imperial power, which she had achieved by the development of her manufactures. And she stood like a colossus astride the sea lanes of the world, making it difficult for any other nation to achieve the sea power which was necessary to the fulfillment of its destiny.

In view of Great Britain's overwhelming naval, commercial, and colonial strength, no single nation could successfully challenge her without powerful assistance from others. "The nations which are less powerful at sea can only match England at sea by uniting their own naval power"; hence every such nation "has an interest in the maintenance and prosperity of the naval power of all other nations"; and, together, they should "constitute themselves into one united naval power" for the purpose, among other things, of preventing undisputed control by Great Britain of the sea lanes of the world. The part of wisdom would be for the continental nations to form a European bloc to check British power.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But List's strategical thinking never had parochial, or even continental, limits. Gazing far into the future, he saw the day when the Stars and Stripes, not the Union Jack, would wave over the seas, and when effective measures would have to be taken by the other nations of the earth to curb the power of the United States: "The same causes which have raised Great Britain to her present exalted position, will (probably in the course of the next century) raise the United States of America to a degree of industry, wealth, and power, which will surpass the position in which England stands, as far as at present England excels little Holland. . . . The naval power of the western world will surpass that of Great Britain, as greatly as its coasts and rivers exceed those of Britain in extent and magnitude. Thus in a not very distant future the natural necessity which now imposes on the French and Germans the necessity of establishing a Continental alliance against the British supremacy, will impose on the British the necessity of establishing a European coalition against the supremacy of America."

Friedrich List's views on England are an interesting study in psychology, perhaps more especially of German psychology. List enormously admired and envied Britain and British liberal institutions, and few men of any nationality have ever paid her more eloquent tributes. On the other hand, he feared and even hated Britain. He himself suffered from a persecution complex — arising out of petty ways in which he was harassed by official Germany — and it was therefore not surprising that he believed that Britain was actively engaged in frustrating the *Zollverein* and other steps toward German unification. Always cantankerous, he became involved in particularly vitriolic controversies with Englishmen — especially, of course, with the long-deceased Adam Smith and his living followers. At the very end of his life, on the other hand, he went to England in the vain hope of paving the way for an Anglo-German alliance. He prepared an elaborate memorandum on the subject which he submitted to Prince Albert, Sir Robert Peel (the prime minister), Lord Clarendon (the foreign minister), and the King of Prussia. He had encouragement from de Bunsen, the Prussian ambassador in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

London, and from some British sources. But Peel could not accede to the plan, and List returned to Germany in the autumn broken in health and in spirit — on the verge of the suicide which occurred November 30, 1846.

There are some fantasies in List's memorandum on the value and the conditions of an Anglo-German alliance, but it nevertheless reveals an acute appreciation of some of the strategic realities facing both countries in the middle of the nineteenth century. To begin with, List foresaw what Sir Halford Mackinder was to elucidate more than half a century later, that there was nothing eternal about British maritime supremacy. The development of steam railways and steam navigation, he thought, might give the continental powers advantages in relation to the British Isles which they did not then possess. The rising power of other nations, especially the United States, held the possibility that control of the seas might be threatened; without control of the seas, the unique advantages which Britain enjoyed from her insular position would become serious liabilities. List foresaw also the union of the Latin and Slavic races, through a Franco-Russian alliance, and believed that Britain and Germany should counterbalance any such combination by taking the lead of the Germanic peoples. He was convinced that Franco-Russian power would not only threaten Britain's interests in Europe and the East but would almost certainly crush Germany. Britain could use the help of a continental land power and Germany would welcome reinforcement from an insular sea power. All that Germany asked of Britain was sympathetic understanding and support for a moderate protective tariff in a unified Germany, which seemed to List a small price for Britain to pay for German friendship. Any such concession, List foresaw, would be resisted by the vested interests of British industry but, against these, Britain must set the fact that her position as a world power would be fortified and even extended.

List failed, as so many others have failed, to find a formula which would lead to Anglo-German solidarity because, for better or for worse, there has never been any agreement between the two nations on what constitutes a true community of interest and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because so many moral and psychological factors have stood in the way of mutual understanding. He failed, also, because he could not undo in a few months the harm which he had done over the years by strident anti-British propaganda.

The greatest single contribution which List made to modern strategy was his elaborate discussion of the influence of railways upon the shifting balance of military power. He first became interested in railways during his residence in America, when he was one of the promoters of the Schuylkill Navigation, Railroad and Coal Company, a forerunner of the present Reading System. Thereafter, railways were one of the passions of his life. His writings on railways fill two complete volumes and almost two pages of the index volume of his collected *Works*. During the years 1835 and 1836 he published *Das Eisenbahn Journal*, a magazine devoted to forwarding railway construction in Germany. To no other single cause did he give more devotion or more energy, for he saw, correctly, that a network of railways, ultimately incorporated in a truly national system, would be one of the forces which would cement German unification.

His interest in the economic effects of railways was to be expected, although he was much more foresighted than most of his contemporaries. But his understanding of the strategic implications to Germany of steam transportation is surprising and by any objective standards quite remarkable. Before the advent of the railway the strategic position of Germany was the weakest in Europe, with the result that she was the traditional battleground of the entire continent. List saw sooner than anyone else that the railway would make the geographical situation of Germany a source of great strength, instead of one of the primary causes of her military weakness. With political unification fortified by a nation-wide link of railway communications, Germany could be made into a defensive bastion in the very heart of Europe. Speed of mobilization, the rapidity with which troops could be moved from the center of the country to its periphery, and the other obvious advantages of "interior lines" of rail transport would be of greater relative advantage to Germany than to any other European country. In a word, List wrote, a perfect railway

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

system would transform the whole territory of the nation into one great fortress, which could be readily defended by its entire combatant man power, with a minimum of expenditure and with the least disorganization of the economic life of the country. And after the conclusion of the war, the return of the troops to their homes could be brought about with equal facility and expedition. For all these reasons, and others, List foresaw that the network of railway lines which he visualized for Germany in 1833 — which is substantially that of the present *Reichsbahnen* — would enable the army of a unified Germany, in the event of invasion, to move troops from any point in the country to the frontiers in such a way as to multiply manyfold its defensive potential and thus prevent the recurrent invasions which had been going on for over two hundred years. Ten times stronger on the defense, Germany also would be ten times stronger on the attack, should she undertake offensive war — which List thought unlikely.

There was a note of urgency in List's pleas for railway construction in Germany. "Every mile of railway which a neighboring nation finishes sooner than we, each mile more of railway it possesses, gives it an advantage over us." Hence, "it is just as little left in our hands to determine whether we shall make use of the new defensive weapons given us by the march of progress, as it was left to our forefathers to determine whether they should shoulder the rifle instead of the bow and arrow." When it is considered that the foregoing was written before the American Civil War gave the first definitive proof of the military value of railways, it shows truly remarkable prescience.

List was wrong in thinking that railways would enable European states to reduce the size of their armies; on the contrary, as the Franco-German War subsequently showed, the railway simplified logistical problems and permitted the movement of larger armies, together with their astronomical quantities of munitions and supplies, than anyone had theretofore believed possible. List was also wrong in thinking that the construction of railways might render attack so costly to the attacker that the danger of war would be mitigated. But he was right in asserting that railway trackage and right of way were relatively less vul-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nerable to military destruction than many other permanent installations — a fact which has most recently been demonstrated in the German bombings of England and in Anglo-American aerial attacks on the Continent.

Even before Germany itself had a railway system, List's dreams went far beyond her borders into the rest of Europe and into Asia. In fact, he seems to have been the originator of the Bagdad Railway idea. In his project for an Anglo-German alliance he proposed that British communications with India and the Far East should be improved by railway lines extending from the English Channel to the Arabian Sea. The Nile and the Red Sea, he wrote, should be brought as close to the British Isles as the Rhine and Elbe were at the time of Napoleon; Bombay and Calcutta should be made as accessible as Lisbon and Cadiz. This could be accomplished by the extension of the projected Belgian-German railway systems to Venice, thence via the Balkans and Anatolia to the Euphrates Valley and the Persian Gulf and, finally, to Bombay. A Syrian spur would link the main line with Cairo and the Sudan. A telegraph line would parallel the railway, so that Downing Street would be in as easy touch with the East Indies as with Jersey and Guernsey. List also visualized a transcontinental line from Moscow to China. None of these projects seemed to him any more ambitious or daring than the plans then being discussed in America for railways from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

To assure political security for the territories through which the proposed railways would pass, Germany and Great Britain should enter into an effective alliance defining their respective spheres of interest. The expansion of German rule over all of European Turkey would prevent interference by any power hostile to the British Empire — speaking in hyperbole, as he so often did, List said that "seventy or eighty millions" of Germans would constitute the guarantee which the situation required. Great Britain, on the other hand, should control all of Asia Minor, Egypt, Central Asia, and India — a vast territory which would more than compensate for the threat of a nascent American world power.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

List's proposal concerning German control of European Turkey was, of course, closely connected with his desire to see large-scale emigration to the Danubian region and the Balkans. Indeed, all his plans for railway construction were in some way linked with his passion for a unified and greater Germany. "A German railway system and the *Zollverein*," he wrote, "are Siamese twins. Born at the same time, physically knit together, of one spirit and one soul, they support each other and strive for the same great aim: the unification of the German tribes into one great, cultivated, wealthy, powerful, and inviolable German nation. Without the *Zollverein* no German railway system would ever have been even discussed, let alone constructed. Only with the aid of a German railway system is it possible for the social economy of the Germans to rise to national greatness, and only through such national greatness can a system of railways realize its full potentialities."

List played a leading role in the nineteenth century revival of mercantilist theories and practices, especially, of course, in Germany. Whatever may have been the virtues of mercantilism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, its modern counterpart has been an incendiary force in a highly inflammable and explosive world. The new mercantilism is the more dangerous because it operates in our highly organized and closely integrated society. It is warp and woof with the war system. To a degree which would have shamed the mercantilists of old, it has enlisted the power of the state for the further enhancement of state power. All of the old, familiar devices have been reinforced by a host of new ones in the form of quotas, boycotts, exchange controls, rationing, stockpiles, and subsidies. Out of the economic nationalism of the fifty years beginning 1870 have come totalitarian economics, the totalitarian state, and totalitarian war, which are so inextricably interconnected that it has become impossible to tell which is cause and which is effect. In the name of national security, political authority has been extended into almost every domain of human activity.

An almost inescapable consequence of all this was the explosions of 1914 and 1939. One cannot, indeed, understand the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two world wars of our generation without reference to the power concepts of the nineteenth century, which are nowhere better stated than in the works of Friedrich List. But List was not the sole author of the neo-mercantilism. He shared the honor or opprobrium with many others including Alexander Hamilton and, surprisingly enough, Adam Smith, who was his favorite object of attack. That the world has come to grief is not necessarily the fault of the mercantilists or the neo-mercantilists. For so long as nations continue to place their faith in unbridled nationalism and unrestricted sovereignty they will rely upon whatever measures will, in their judgment, best guarantee independence and security. Competitive nation-states are inherent in the war system, upon which, alas, international society has heretofore been based.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some American Contributions to the Science of Hypnosis

Frank A. Pattie

HYPNOSIS is a curious and baffling phenomenon. To put a person into the hypnotic trance we tell him he is going to sleep, yet the hypnotic state is not a form of sleep. We tell him he will be under our control and he is, but only up to a certain point. He appears extremely obedient and eager to give the operator the results desired; but hypnosis is something more than a particular attitude of obedience assumed by the subject, since some of his abilities in the trance are greater than they are in the normal state when he assumes a similar attitude of obedience. We can produce anesthesias of various organs of sense; in some ways these anesthesias appear genuine, in others feigned. The field of hypnosis thus encloses many unresolved paradoxes.

The most recent assaults on these paradoxes have come from psychological laboratories in the United States. This fact itself is remarkable, for until about eighteen years ago American psychologists had made no significant contribution to our knowledge of hypnosis. It is true, of course, that in their treatises some American psychologists — James, Münsterberg, and Titchener among them — gave space to hypnosis, but they observed it only casually. They did not formulate problems and then set to work to solve them by means of experiment.

To some extent the failure to carry on experiments on hypnosis may have been owing to the too perfect theories devised to explain it. For example, Titchener's theory reduced hypnosis to the level of the commonplace; it was, according to him, merely an exaggeration of certain features of normal everyday mental life — concentration of attention was invoked to explain suggestibility. Inability to remember events occurring in the trance was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Titchener no more mysterious than the fact that a man on the golf links forgets his office. To some extent also this neglect by Titchener and other psychologists following the tradition of Wundt grew out of their rather exclusive interest in "the generalized mind of the normal human adult." Hypnosis was not part of the subject matter they proposed to investigate. But the most important cause of the neglect doubtless lay in the unrespectable and unsavory associations — obtaining since the time of Mesmer — of hypnosis with quackery, occultism, and the performances of itinerant showmen. George du Maurier's sentimental novel *Trilby* in the nineties presented a false and terrifying picture of hypnosis. It is significant that Münsterberg never hypnotized anyone "for mere experiment's sake but always for medical purposes only." Associations of hypnosis with the unrespectable were no doubt influential not only in securing the dominance of the clinical over the purely scientific motive; they may also have had something to do with the formulation of those all-too-perfect theories that disposed of the subject by leaving little or nothing to be investigated.

But, in spite of its early handicaps, hypnosis was too interesting a phenomenon to escape the attention of the experimental psychologist forever. It came at last into the laboratory largely through the influence of the late William McDougall of Harvard and of Clark L. Hull of the University of Minnesota and Yale. Under McDougall's direction Paul C. Young in 1923 performed the first hypnotic experiments leading to an American doctorate in psychology. And Hull stimulated research both among his own students and others by an article published in 1930 that listed no fewer than 102 problems deserving investigation in this field. While it was hardly to be expected that the experimental psychologists would revolutionize a branch of science worked over by medical men for 150 years, they have nevertheless made important advances in our knowledge.

The results of the work of experimental psychologists on hypnosis have been to a considerable extent negative in character — they have shown what hypnosis is not, that it will not do certain things claimed for it. It was natural that this should be the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outcome of many of the investigations; from the beginning the subject had been almost exclusively in the hands of physicians whose principal interest in it was confined to its therapeutic value, a condition favorable not to the increase of scientific knowledge but to the accretion of mistaken ideas. Then, too, certain American psychologists have oversimplified matters. Some of these oversimplifications have already been corrected. Despite these negative factors the effects of hypnosis are acknowledged to be remarkable even by the most tough-minded scientist; by its aid illusions and hallucinations can be produced, anesthesias for major surgical operations can be induced, old memories not available in the normal state can be recovered and peculiar alterations of personality can be brought about. Hypnosis remains an attractive field of research, for not only do many facts await discovery but there remains the task, hardly lightened at all by recent experimentation, of formulating a comprehensive theory of hypnosis.

One of the oldest problems, the relationship between the hypnotic trance and sleep, was one of the first to be attacked by a student of Hull. Over a long period of years hypnosis has been associated with sleep. In the usual technique for inducing hypnosis the subject reclines in a comfortable chair while the operator tells him that he feels very tired, that he is thinking of nothing but going to sleep, and that his eyes will close, whereupon he will be asleep. The suggestions continue monotonously and without intermission either until the subject's eyes close or until the operator concludes that the experiment is a failure. These associations with sleep quite naturally led James Braid, an English physician, in 1843 to name the phenomena of the trance "neuro-hypnotism" or nervous sleep. But Hull's student, M. J. Bass, proved that the physiological signs of sleep are absent in the trance. The tendon reflexes, diminished or entirely absent in sleep, are of normal strength in hypnosis; a tap on the patellar tendon over the kneecap elicits a normal kick. Subsequently other American workers demonstrated that the respiration, heart action, and brain potentials in the trance are characteristic of the waking state rather than of sleep. Moreover, the essential phenomena of the hypnotic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trance can be produced when all references to sleep or eye-closure are omitted in the suggestions made to the subject.

What are the characteristics of a good hypnotic subject? The difference between the responses of good subjects and subjects who prove refractory is so great that one might expect the two classes of persons to be sharply differentiated in their personalities. But the search for distinguishing marks has failed almost completely. The first theory in this field, important principally because its author was a French neurologist of the highest distinction, Charcot, proved to be wrong. In the 1880's Charcot asserted that susceptibility to the deeper stages of hypnosis is a symptom of a mental disorder, hysteria, and that only neurotic persons of hysterical type could be hypnotized. His contemporary, Bernheim, and other medical men opposed his theory. By means of various measurements of personality traits, American psychologists have confirmed Bernheim's opinion. Charcot's only subjects were a few hysterical women; his error was one of too hasty generalization. It is now established that susceptibility carries with it no stigma of neuroticism. To say this, however, is not to deny that there are certain striking similarities between the phenomena of hypnosis and the amnesias, paralyses, and anesthesias of hysteria.

Though a good hypnotic subject is by no means a neurotic, he is suggestible. What is this trait of suggestibility? Is it merely suggestibility in the hypnotic situation or is it a trait pervading the whole personality and making the good subject in his everyday life show more than average credulity, gullibility, proneness to accept the opinions of others? American investigators have found that there is no relation between these latter traits and the ability of the subject to go into the trance. Nor is susceptibility related to extraversion and introversion or to dominance and submissiveness. Intelligence has in some investigations in this country been found to be unrelated to susceptibility, whereas in others a small positive correlation has been discovered — that is, a very slight tendency for the more suggestible subjects to be somewhat above the average in intelligence. These results are enough, in the words of Hull, "to dissipate the somewhat vague but widespread belief

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that for a person to be susceptible to hypnosis is an indication of feeble intelligence." Recently R. W. White of Harvard has discovered a small positive correlation between a subject's "need for deference" (that is, deference to a person in a position of authority) and susceptibility and a small negative correlation between susceptibility and the "need for autonomy or independence." In other words, the higher the subject's rating on the "need for deference" the higher his susceptibility, and the higher his "need for autonomy" the lower his susceptibility. The coefficients of correlation are so small, however, that if one were to try to predict the susceptibility of a number of persons by referring only to their ratings on one of these needs, the predictions would be only one-tenth less in error than guesses based on no knowledge of the subjects whatever. Susceptibility to hypnosis is either a relatively isolated trait, not strongly linked with other traits, or else a characteristic resulting from a number of different patterns of traits — patterns not revealed by our present techniques of personality measurement. Perhaps, as White suggests, our next step, if we are to determine how hypnotic susceptibility originates in the individual, will consist of the study of very detailed life-histories. We might thus discover certain types of trait-patterns or organizations giving rise to susceptibility.

Any discussion of hypnosis always raises two questions among laymen. One is this: Is hypnosis real? When a teacher demonstrates hypnosis in his class he usually finds that some students are skeptical; they believe that the subject, knowing what is expected of a hypnotized person, is merely faking, playing a role. But the ordinary student does not know enough to enable him to imitate the behavior of a hypnotized subject in all situations. The operator can be sure that a person who is apparently in a deep trance is not simulating if his behavior conforms to certain generally unknown criteria. If, for example, a subject is genuinely in a deep trance and is given a suggestion to be carried out after he comes out of the trance, he spontaneously goes back into the trance (that is, into a state of heightened suggestibility) during the performance of the suggestion and comes out of it after the suggestion is completed. This spontaneous induction of a state

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of heightened suggestibility while the subject is carrying out a post-hypnotic suggestion occurs no matter whether the suggestion is carried out ten minutes or ten days after the original trance. Since very few persons used as subjects in experiments know anything about this feature of hypnotic behavior, the operator can be practically certain that if they conform to this pattern they have been genuinely in the trance and not simulating it. Americans did not discover this fact, but the psychologist's understanding of this and related phenomena has been made more precise and detailed in a recent paper by Milton Erickson, a psychiatrist of Eloise, Michigan, who has made studies of hypnosis from both the clinical and experimental points of view.

The other question the layman nearly always asks is this: How far does the subject's suggestibility go? Can the operator pass beyond the innocuous suggestions of the usual experiment and induce the subject to harm himself or others? Older and newer authorities alike say no. The subject will do nothing contrary to his moral standards or harmful to himself. In most instances this statement is correct; the subject is by no means an automaton. In fact, we often see a subject offer successful resistance to certain rather trivial commands which he does not like. Yet there is some evidence, both experimental and clinical, which contradicts the usual answer. In a recent experiment, devised by Loyd Rowland of Baylor University, subjects in the trance were directed to pick up a live rattlesnake, apparently in an open box but actually behind an invisible pane of glass. All but one of his four subjects tried to grasp the snake. Two other subjects were given a bottle of strong acid and told to throw it at the experimenter's face, also behind invisible glass. They threw the acid. Normal subjects in the same situation all refused to carry out the orders. (It seems unlikely that the hypnotized subjects were able to detect the invisible glass.) It might be argued that the hypnotized subjects acted as they did because they knew they were participating in a laboratory experiment and were under the care of a responsible person who would not allow them to injure themselves or him. The normal subjects, it would be assumed, did not feel an equal degree of protection. The experiment would there-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fore not throw much light on what might be done in a situation outside the laboratory.

Following Rowland's work, Erickson reported an extensive series of experiments in which he tried to induce subjects to commit certain objectionable acts in situations designed to appear as little as possible like laboratory experiments and in which the responsibility for the acts was shared to a minimum degree by the experimenter. The subjects were asked to steal small sums of money, to read their roommates' letters, and to do other things of like character. Erickson was uniformly unsuccessful. In a few cases the subjects reluctantly performed the desired act but nullified its effect either then or later. For the rest they stubbornly, and with a good deal of resentment toward the experimenter, refused or evaded the instructions. In some cases subjects in the trance refused to do certain things (such as the playing of practical jokes on other persons) which later in the waking state they did very readily of their own volition.

There is another type of experiment, first reported in 1941, on the production of crime. The subject is shown a coat and told that he will "falsely perceive" it as his own and that he will "falsely remember" having put a dollar in its pocket. He is then directed to remove the dollar from the coat and to spend it at a later time. In the original experiment, reported by Wesley R. Wells of Syracuse University, the coat belonged to the experimenter. It is curious that the act of taking the money in these circumstances should be regarded as criminal from the point of view of either the subject or the witnesses to the experiment. How could it be seen as anything more than the receipt of a peculiarly indirect gift from the experimenter? The experiment would be more convincing if the ownership of the coat were unknown to the subject. Margaret Brenman, a research worker at the Menninger Clinic, reports three experiments in which, though ownership was unknown, the subjects took the money. Yet these experiments were performed in the atmosphere of a laboratory and the subjects were well aware that the situation was experimental. Further modifications of the procedure should be made before we can be sure that in a non-experimental situation, when we use

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a technique that eliminates moral conflict by implanting false perceptions and memories, subjects can be made to perform acts contrary to their moral nature.

In the book *Das Verbrechen in Hypnose* (Crime in Hypnosis), published in 1937, a study that seems to have escaped the attention of recent writers, Ludwig Mayer, a German physician, gives us clinical evidence on the same problem. This book describes the case of a woman, pronounced mentally normal by psychiatrists, who came under the influence of a criminal hypnotist. He represented himself as a physician and pretended to treat her. Over a period of seven years he controlled the woman and compelled her to steal money for him, to make attempts (that were abortive) to kill herself and to shoot her husband, and to submit to other abuses. Ultimately the man, who seems to have been a psychopathic personality, received a prison sentence of ten years. But a case of this kind is very unusual.

It has been said that repeated induction of hypnosis will make the subject highly suggestible in his daily life, will "weaken his will" and make him unduly dependent upon the hypnotizer. Among American investigators, however, fear of such undesirable consequences seems to have vanished completely.

Although as early as the 1840's James Esdaile, the English surgeon, performed hundreds of operations, major and minor, in India with no other anesthetic than hypnosis, the nature of hypnotically-produced anesthesias is not yet clear. Ten years ago R. R. Sears of Yale University, investigating hypnotic anesthesia of the skin, discovered that when an ordinarily painful stimulus was applied to a leg anesthetized by hypnosis, the usual physiological accompaniments of pain appeared but were diminished in amount in comparison with those elicited when the non-anesthetic leg was stimulated in the same way. Those bodily changes most amenable to voluntary control were most diminished and those least amenable were least affected: the respiratory reactions were practically absent when the anesthetized leg was stimulated, the rise in pulse rate was 77 per cent less than normal, and the variability of pulse was 50 per cent of normal. Least affected of all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was the impalpable sweat secretion that accompanies the onset of a painful stimulus. Sears concluded that these effects could not be caused by a mere pretense of anesthesia on the part of his subjects. He asked his subjects to try to simulate an anesthesia while they were in the normal state but their efforts produced almost no effect. Erickson, who has studied hypnotically-induced deafness, has found that some subjects, selected from a large number, appeared to be genuinely deaf when various tests were applied.

It must be remembered, however, that a subject may be made deaf to the voices of all persons in a room except that of the operator or blind to one card in a deck but not to the others. These limited anesthesias, corresponding, in the words of White, to no "plausible biological units," are obviously cases of voluntary ignoring of the particular stimuli chosen by the operator. Experiments of this sort consequently raise the question: Are the cases of apparent total deafness or apparent total skin anesthesia due primarily to the subjects' deliberate will to ignore all sensations of sound or touch; or are these anesthesias due to an actual blocking somewhere in the central nervous system of nerve currents originating in the ear or in the skin? In other words, do they behave, except for the fact that they can be terminated by command, like those caused by severing a sensory nerve?

Experiments by the present writer compel him to return a negative answer to the last question. The fingers of the subject's hands were interlaced in such a way that when one finger was touched the subject could not tell whether the finger belonged to the right or the left hand. When one hand was made anesthetic in the trance and the fingers of the two hands were touched a number of times in quick succession by two experimenters, with the subject asked to count the number of times he was touched on his sound hand, it was found that he could do very little if at all better than a normal subject could when his hands were similarly clasped and similarly touched. The supposed anesthesia availed nothing when the subject had his hands in a position preventing him from knowing whether a given touch fell on the right or on the left hand. Another experiment, in which the writer tried to produce

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blindness of one eye, gave similar results. With all but one of five subjects, simple tests showed that both eyes, the "blind" and the normal, were being used. This one subject, not obeying instructions and cleverly evading detection, was able to pass certain simple tests seeming to indicate that one eye was blind. She was finally given a card on which there was a confused array of lines in several different colors. If she used both eyes the material would be unintelligible; if she used only the eye behind the red glass she could easily read letters and numerals since the red glass made red, yellow, and orange lines in the printed material invisible. This test trapped her and revealed that she was using both eyes.

These results are negative. They do not, of course, logically exclude the possibility that sometime a person may be found whose anesthesias are genuine in the sense of behaving like those caused by the cutting of nerves. The writer's results, which strongly suggest that anesthesias are primarily caused by an effort to ignore some part of the environment, are not necessarily in conflict with the results of Erickson's experiments on deafness. His subjects (selected from a large number of hypnotizable persons) may be regarded as those who were most successful, in a population of some size, in ignoring their auditory environment. Furthermore, his subjects could be made totally deaf to one kind of sound and at the same time not deaf to others. The writer's experiments indicate that, where it is impossible for the subject to localize a sensation on the right or the left side, an attitude of purposeful ignoring cannot operate successfully, and the anesthesia of the single eye or hand breaks down. If we interpret anesthesias as originating from a desire to ignore, the problem still remains: Why is the hypnotized person's effort so very successful when he tries to produce total deafness or insensitivity to the pain of a dental operation? Perhaps the hypnotic subject's strong belief that the organ in question is actually anesthetic has something to do with the matter.

The relationship between memory and hypnosis is a question of some popular interest. Students often ask their teacher of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

psychology, "If I were to take an examination in the trance would I be able to remember more than I could in the normal state?" Until recently the instructor replied, "No, hypnosis will not help you to remember recently learned material. We do have evidence, though, that old memories such as memories of poems learned by heart in childhood are more extensively recalled by the average person in the trance than otherwise. Moreover, in some cases memories of events of early childhood, not available in the normal state, can be brought up in the trance." This reply was based upon an experiment, carried on in Hull's laboratory, in which the recently learned material was made up of nonsense words. The result obtained with nonsense was believed to hold for all kinds of memorized material. White and his associates later proved that this conclusion was incorrect and that the recall of recently acquired meaningful material is as much facilitated by the trance as the recall of very old memories of poems. They found that the average subject can remember one and a half times as many items in the trance as in the normal state.

The problems discussed above — anesthesias, the relationships of hypnosis to sleep, to traits of personality, and to memory, the genuineness and the potential dangers of hypnosis — are but a few of the problems attacked by American psychologists in the last two decades. Parallel with these purely scientific developments there has been during the same period a revival of interest in the clinical use of hypnosis for the treatment of the psychoneuroses, not as a means of exorcising the symptoms but as an instrument for exploring the disordered personality and finding the causes of the trouble. Research on the use of hypnosis in psychotherapy and as a means of substantiating some of the newer psychiatric theories is being carried on by individuals and is also being sponsored by the Menninger Foundation.

The simultaneous study of the experimental and the clinical aspects of hypnosis is much to be desired; a purely scientific investigation without application would be useless, as would the merely clinical use of a poorly understood therapeutic instrument.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Westerner Views the U. S. A.

Edward M. Miller

MANY a westerner holds to the vague belief that his beginnings date back no farther than the covered wagon days, when his great-great-grandparents, or his grandparents, made choice of the west. Actually the westerner is the terminal product of an American process that began more than 300 years ago when ambitious peoples, fed up with the inequities and restraints of Europe, set out to establish a world where the individual might flourish. A good many of the early comers were singularly ill-equipped for the job. Plymouth folk learned the hard way — by experience.

Time brought stability and comfortable institutions, however, and many were content. There were others who preferred not to await the fruition of the clipper ship and the flowering of political genius in Virginia. These were the westerners, the restless ones, and the settlement of the Tidewater served both as reason and excuse for malcontents to roam inland and onward in search of more space and better fortune. Progress was slow. Dating from Plymouth, 200 years were required to push modest distances beyond the Mississippi, and it was not until 1843 that the first substantial group of migrants set out from Missouri for the Pacific Northwest. There were earlier settlements in California, but the tide did not reach its height until the discovery of California gold in 1848. Thus, pertinent time for westerners stems from the 40's to the 80's. During those years most of the livable areas of the west, save for earlier Spanish and Mexican settlements in the southwest, saw their first homesteaders.

The great migration to the far west, in which the migrant of the early 1840's was a zestful participant, represented the culmination of an amazing group of fortuitous circumstances. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had evolved a magnificent political philosophy calculated to dignify and inspire the in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dividual — a philosophy with which by the early 1800's the American people had been imbued and which had found workable expression in the exuberant confidence of Jeffersonian democracy.

The western migration took place at a time when the American people were no longer amateurs in the business of bending a wilderness to their needs. Fortune smiled on the westerners when she gave them blood sufficiently kindred to permit effective, efficient colonization; and time had released the bonds of early inhibitions stemming from secularized religion.

World events conspired to make the western lands available exactly when preparations were complete. Napoleonic ambition provided all Louisiana, the controversy with Britain was a signboard and a spur to the Oregon country, and Mexico's tenuous hold on California was an evident temptation. Finally, the resources of the west were to prove adequate for the encouragement and support of a high standard of living.

Never in all the history of the world had so many peoples, so admirably equipped, set out to emblazon their destiny on slate so clean.

Such were the legacies to the westerner-to-be. As an individual he displayed vital American characteristics destined to gain new vigor from the men who bore them: dogged enterprise, ingenuity, and a sublime confidence in God, himself, and the Bill of Rights. To these must be added a restless, feverish enthusiasm for his own forthright version of social security, "Oregon or Bust," scrawled on the side of his wagon. The cynical will ascribe his delirium to the lure of free lands. (Congress, in due course, allotted 320 acres to each emigrant. With a wife he got 640.) True, ordinary greed fairly designates the motives of many who sought gold and lands, but it does not suffice to explain the tormenting fever that compelled men to snatch wives and children from established homes and to thrust them into the hazards of Indians, flood, and famine. Acres, alone, do not provide explanation.

No, the peoples of the wagon trains were willing victims of the frontier, questers for an illusive substance, which today we call the American Dream — new words to identify the compelling urge and confident hope for a better world.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For all the spiritual legacies and ties with the past, it should not be forgotten that the long, dangerous trip across the plains was the most spectacular of all the American breaks with the past, both in fact and in the minds of the participants. If their going was an affirmation of hope in a beckoning future, it was also a breaking away from the shackles, real or imagined, they had known in the east. In the fullness of the break they were discarding residual accumulations of time, contagious behaviour patterns, to which the attitudes and actions of men are inevitably susceptible. There was stern symbolism when, to ease the strain on thinning oxen, the migrants ruthlessly tossed aside their few keepsakes of an ordered past. Spiritual legacies had been stripped of all trimmings and trappings when their bearers gained Pacific saltwater.

The newcomers to the west were to find need of all their resources. Nature decreed the west should be desolate and beautiful and tough — and the beauty should be that of the bold, sweeping stroke. Here were the nation's tallest mountains, wildest rivers, biggest canyons, tallest trees, heaviest rains, deepest snows, driest deserts. In later times such items were to wring profit from tourists. To early settlers they were nightmares come true.

First came the Rockies, a massive range sprawling from Canada to Mexico. Beyond and parallel to the Rockies the migrants encountered an arid trough 600 miles wide. It was laced and interlaced with canyons of great rivers. It was strewn with ten thousand named and nameless errant buttes and mountains and was centered by the Great Salt Lake.

Beyond the trough a second major range of mountains, called the Cascades in the north and the Sierra Nevadas in the south, offered towering snow capped peaks. With final mountains surmounted, the migrants spilled down into the valleys at or near Pacific tidewater where they founded the future large cities of the coast. The vast expanse between the Pacific and the Rockies soon became dotted with settlers from the east or by others who backwashed from the Pacific.

Now began the great adventure, the great question mark: Would the western men and women, thrown on their own re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sources, utilize to full measure the gifts and talents fortune had bestowed?

The west forced a new factor into the colonization of America; namely, the conquest of aridity. Few easterners realize the extent to which aridity and semi-aridity prevails throughout the west. The dryness forced concentration on water, or rather, the scarcity of water. There were feuds over water holes and bankruptcies from water rights, but out of the process of bringing fertility to sage flats there emerged the spirit of enterprise underlying irrigation, the cup of life in the west.

Climate and geography gave rise to many other occupations either new to the American scene or destined to become identified with the west: cattle ranching; sheep raising; gold, silver, and copper mining. To these must be added the time-honored means of livelihood — logging of trees, sawing of lumber, subsistence farming, shipping, trade, doctoring, and lawyering. All of them required new applications, new solutions to fit virgin surroundings. The challenge was great, the task was immense. After 100 years the job of whittling down the west to man's size still remains undone.

I nave dwelt upon physiography and industry to emphasize an obvious but easily overlooked fact: the westerner has been forced into intense preoccupation with the physical job at hand. When you are uprooting firs and sage, fighting and fleecing Indians, launching steamboats, scheming railroads, gouging highways, and building the great projects of current date — under such circumstances you do not philosophize about the implications of historical processes. To the contrary, you sweat, and pin your faith on the morrow.

The western character emerged from its mold about the turn of the century. Native American attributes remained basic, but the westerner had been conditioned strongly by his lack of concern with the past, his preoccupation with the urgencies of the present, a receptivity toward innovations, and an uncritical faith in a better future.

With this formula in mind, it will be seen the westerner is a relatively uncomplicated person. He enjoys the naïveté of a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

youthful people. He has escaped the searing scars of cynicism and despair, for he has been spared the lash of major regional conflicts and catastrophes — no civil wars, no reconstruction, no dust bowls, no gaunt cotton mills.

Furthermore, his mind remains uncluttered with worrisome abstractions. Why should he bother about the fine points of Magna Carta, the philosophy of the Lockes and the Rousseaus, the statutes of Virginia, even the implications of the Declaration of Independence when he is the living epitome of all the freedoms ever invented?

As an individual the westerner is easy-going, casual, and not given to the furrowed brow. His affection for nature is tremendous, and he counts hunting and fishing the finest of all pastimes. He is well disposed toward his fellow-men. Friendliness is given as a matter of course and without reservations. The westerner's candor is immense — what he thinks, he says, and expects you to reply in kind.

We revere the practical. Save in Carmel and San Francisco, a connoisseur of the fine arts can be mighty lonesome west of the Rockies. Contrariwise, domestic architecture flourishes admirably. A *good* house is *practical.*

The manifestations of the body politic are of infinite variety and utterly incomprehensible to many strangers. We film the sexiest movies, adhere to the strictest morals, commercialize divorce, build splendid schools, germinate the nuttiest cults, build the biggest bombers, tolerate inexcusable insane asylums, wear the weirdest clothes, indulge in honest politics and goofy politics, revere the D.A.R., and root for Marian Anderson. Where is the pattern?

In early days, the absence of traditional pressures gave rise to many excesses. Fortunately, the traveling kits of migrants contained many a strong dose of subduing Calvinism. Stern cathartics eliminated the most obnoxious excesses, and recovery brought back the good health of vigorous enterprise.

Relatively few of our people, save those lured by the arts or by prospects of professional advancement, have any desire to migrate eastward. Yet this is no bar to curiosity. Most westerners

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are born with itchy feet, and they speak with apologetic regret if their travels have not included a journey to the Atlantic. There are riches ahead for the westerner who will travel back the trail in honest search for treasures hidden in those 250 years so lightly cast aside by his great-great-grandparents. His riches will consist of a new and deeply thrilling conception of America and, yes, an exciting introspective knowledge of himself.

Our traveler encounters the beauty of the eastern countryside with a surprise akin to shock. Weaned on the expansive travel brochures of the Union Pacific, he learns to his astonishment that a miniature in proper setting asks no favors from a mural.

Autumn leaves in New York and New England are unbelievably gay. Views 'round the bends of rural lanes surely were invented for the special benefit of cameras. Roadside stands give hints of productivity unsuspected in soil so thin. The endless stone walls give testimony to patient, toilsome affection for this stony land.

The visitor readily extends respect for the Palisades of the Hudson, and he is enchanted with the well-groomed farms and stone barns of Pennsylvania. The soft beauty of Virginia is a revelation. In all the land, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, Virginia offers the most persuasive invitation for the establishment of a country home. Amblings through the Great Smokies of North Carolina teach the lesson that eastern mountains wear well. Western peaks exude the frigidity of their ice caps. Eastern mountains, tolerant with age, invite companionship.

The deep south has been visioned as a vast flat space, white with cotton. It is an agreeable surprise to discover the intriguing red soil pleasantly contoured and mantled with pines. The camera finds much to record as the journey continues to Charleston's Magnolia Gardens and the nearby highways canopied with Spanish moss. There is an album respect, too, for Florida's royal palms, for the seductive azure coast line and the efficiently maintained orange groves.

Our visitor readily understands and readily approves many an evidence of vigorous eastern enterprise. He thrills to the boldness of New York: the skyline at dusk, the spectacle from the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Empire State, the magnificence of Park Avenue, the clamor of the Holland Tunnel, and the precision of the Rockettes. He mingles astonishment with applause when confronted with the parkways of the New York area, superb creations surpassing all other American thoroughfares in beauty and in the conception of their fitness to new dimensions of new times.

The surging power of industry breaks through the screen of soot and grime. The sight and smell of heavy industry contribute to the visitor's sense of propinquity, to the main stream of American affairs, and so does a visit to Congress and likewise an elevator ride in Rockefeller Center. Equally powerful in this respect are the national shrines.

The books have told us that human experience did not begin in 1843 and have explained that certain men of the Revolution were persons of consequence. A single visit to the tasteful splendor of Mount Vernon is worth many a chapter in spreading forth a graphic story of accumulated capital, gracious living, and powerful idealism. One willingly makes tourist trips to Lexington and Concord; to the Lincoln Memorial; to the slave market in Charleston and the relics of St. Augustine. At Monticello and the University of Virginia the man Jefferson becomes a living personality.

We need the jar of experience, the sight and feel of actuality. The east reeks with the actuality of men and deeds. It seeps out of the past and it floods the present. There comes a time when the newcomer, too, joins the stream and finds it good. He has become a part of propinquity.

Time has been indulgent to the east but time has, with no less emphasis, been cruel. She has wiped the bright light of hope from so many faces.

I cannot forget the utter dejection in the eyes of the mountain woman, babe in elbow, who watched our car take gas in Tennessee; the whine in the voice of the bony woman selling roadside orange juice in Florida; the tired sharpness of the change vendor in Boston's subway; the humility of the black waiter in Charleston; the furrowed sweat on the girl in the quick lunch, Gotham. And the wistful children on a New York ferry who, intrigued by our western r's and a's, shyly offered conversation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I cannot forget many houses in the south. You are driving on a highway. Far ahead you perceive the fine lines of a stately structure, and there flashes a picture of discriminating taste and high purpose. Still closer — the house needs paint, but windows and chimneys have been spaced by a knowing hand. Closeup — a chicken drowses in a window ledge where glass should be, and untidy children, sometimes black, sometimes white, sit in listless play on the splintery porch. Is this the price of boll weevil, reconstruction, hot summers, tenant farming, soil exhaustion, the Ku Klux Klan, and the one-party system?

A few hours drive takes one from the miserable huts of Georgia and northern Florida, not fit for animals but housing human beings, to the blatant hotels and private sands of Miami Beach. There is no need here to describe, in dreary detail, the hovels of southern share-croppers, the Negro sections of Savannah and Charleston, the slums of Washington and New York. I am told the residents of Baltimore take rightful pride in the whiteness of their door-steps. For my part, I drove with something akin to horror through endless streets packed and jammed with identical brick flats. Is it possible for man to gestate a spark of individuality in surroundings such as these?

Throughout an eastern journey the western observer will remain uncomfortably aware of group segregations or conflicts, or lack of assimilations as evidenced in the crackers, the mountaineers, and Jim Crows; coal miners, Polacks, Harlem; Jews in New York and Irish in Boston; the very rich and the very poor.

Such matters dismay the westerner because his insufficient background permits neither sympathetic understanding nor intelligent solution of severe social conflicts. Out west we have long since made peace with the Indian; the problem of the roving Oakies is not insoluble; Mexicans are not ambitious; and the Chinese, great favorites of the moment, are notable at minding their own business. The Japanese remain our great question, and even they have not greatly entered our daily consciousness.

So, caught in the eddies of eastern class dissensions, the westerner reacts in a manner simple, direct, and not wholly courageous. He craves escape. There are too many people.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Any westerner who precipitously departs, literally or figuratively, does himself and his host a strong injustice; for he unwittingly disdains the east's finest heritage — the capacity for mature social relationships and mature social responsibilities.

He who remains will soon make the happy discovery that the easterner is really a very nice person. True, you will continue to feel the chill indifference of the many toward the one; and you learned early that proper credentials and suitable sponsors are mandatory passports in crossing eastern barriers of caution. Once that barrier is broken, the man of the Atlantic demonstrates a rare talent for indulgence in the amenities, and an enviable capacity for obtaining enjoyment therefrom.

I am thinking of the southerner who, his day's work done or undone, sits on the front porch that he may hail greetings to passersby; the amazing ability of the same southerner to accept the burden of prolonged conversation and to do so in a manner both entertaining and persuasively flattering to his companion. The congenial buzz-buzz-buzzing of New York garment workers during sidewalk recess is a phenomenon unknown in the west, likewise the happy abandon of a New Year's crowd in Times Square.

But the east's capacity for human relationships extends beyond the range of good fun, pleasing manners, and gracious hospitality. At Harvard University I found all these. I also found an amazing combination of driving energy, a sustained devotion to truth for the sake of truth, a healthy conception of, and allegiance to, American ideals, and — most important of all — a restless conscience that demands acceptance of a full share of responsible leadership in bettering the pattern of American life. Certainly I do not suggest that the school on the Charles is unique in these respects. I do say its sense of urgency and vigor of application is beyond my previous experience.

One does not forget that some of Harvard's most handsome living quarters steal the sun from quite awful Cambridge flats — unhappy symbolism of the great eastern gap between those who are in and those who are out. But neither should we forget that Franklin Roosevelt, who may have seen those flats, has demon-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strated the twentieth century's most vivid sense of social responsibility. In accepting this leadership Mr. Roosevelt was following the eastern tradition of maturity — that of providing a vastly preponderant share of American political, social, and intellectual leadership. Out of the east have come the powerful and enduring forces which generate ground swells for the surging greatness of the nation.

To the western man there comes a time for home-going. The 3,400-mile journey finds its climax in a blizzard at the summit of the Rockies. This is home. Presently you are indulging in reflections, making evaluations.

Certainly there is a new crop of stories to tell: about the evenly-spread beauty of the eastern landscape and the frightfully messy signboards along the highways of Florida; the expensively tanned loafers at Miami Beach, and the sincere search throughout the east for new solutions of employer-employee relationships, the contrast of slums and new federal housing projects side by side in Savannah. You will tell of children of the east, less robust, less active, and better mannered. The soot of the east, the pressure of crowds, the might of the factories, and the genius of the easterner for fellowship. And New England intellectual vigor surmounting, shall we say, an occasional lapse into graveyard philosophy, a kow-towing to age for the sake of age?

And the west? You see with new eyes that many a desolate mile stands between the deepest canyons, the highest mountains, the cleanest rivers. Many of the farms are not very tidy. There are flashes of impatient intolerance. Yet you bring home the simple conviction that the casteless west is better for the average man, the common man, for yourself. Yet, still, the west is not the whole loaf. You will regret standing aside from the main stream of events.

A few years ago I journeyed with the late Thomas Wolfe through a large portion of the west. The novelist, readily sensing the zest of the area, expressed his approval by saying the west is America's horizon. But a visit to Salt Lake prompted him to erupt in violent protest against the moral restrictions enforced by the Mormon church — and all other churches. The restrictions,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he contended, fettered a man's soul and produced minds distinguished only by their mediocrity.

When countered with the argument that ecclesiastical restrictions, however arbitrary, had aided greatly in the production of a wealth of good citizenry, Wolfe impatiently brushed the point aside. Great men, he said, are compounded of complete intellectual freedom, sharp cleavages, and bold crises. One genius — one bright, guiding light — is worth a host of plodding citizens, no matter how law-abiding.

Wolfe's argument becomes provocative when one observes the dearth of truly great names associated with the land west of the Rockies, save in the sciences dealing with material things. Our list of statesmen, novelists, economists, social scientists, educators has not been impressive.

I suggest the west has been too young and too busy and too fortunate to produce the guiding lights. Give us a little more time. Already there are signs. History may say the west became adult in 1929, for we too shared that crisis; we are now up to the hilt in war; and we too will share in postwar plans. Those who know, say Douglas of Washington is one of America's two great New Deal philosophers, and the other is mid-westerner Wallace.

The eastern ground swells dedicated to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for the individual thrust some of their finest breakers into the west. Now the east sends new impulses of social responsibility, intimations that the self-sufficient individual must ally himself with less fortunate individuals. Surely the west will send back strength of its own, even as the farthest breaker of the flood tide returns to make impress on the sea.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

College and the Century of the Common Man

Algo D. Henderson

RIGHT now there is considerable fluttering in the educational dovecotes over what the war is going to do to our colleges and universities. During the next few years, and especially following the war, American higher education faces a grave crisis.

From the kaleidoscopic uncertainty which seems to be all we can be sure of in the years to come, one inescapable fact emerges. The solution of the postwar twenties — a return to bigger and better football games, raccoon coats, rah-rah, and cynical escapism — is not tenable this time. To educators it should be one of the tragedies of the century that higher education did almost nothing to change its pattern then. Even today the experimental colleges and universities of this country can be numbered on the fingers of both hands. After the present war, however, it is doubtful if educational institutions will be offered the option of drifting back to "normalcy." This time they will probably have to move and move fast if they are to survive.

The postwar world is going to be a world of tremendous disillusionment, cynicism, and bitterness. Even if substantial progress should be made towards a better world organization, the mood of the future will not be immediately optimistic. Progress can never measure up to the ideals generated during the struggle, and there will be much individual maladjustment as people try to pick up the broken threads of their lives.

It is going to be one of the jobs of our colleges and universities to counteract this bitterness. Recent critics have been vocal over the moral bankruptcy of American education during the last quarter-century. They say we have often been too timid to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present unpleasant social facts; and when we *have* presented facts, we have prided ourselves on presenting them "objectively," in a solvent of doubt. We have adopted an agnostic attitude towards all values, and have so scrupulously refrained from "propagandizing" the student that he has emerged with no values at all.

I believe these allegations are well founded. American education has been timidly intellectualistic. It has forgotten that intellectualism is only a method — meaningless in itself unless applied to some course of action, some emotional content. Now there is a vast difference between handing the individual an authoritarian system of values and helping him to cast up a trial balance. Colleges must no longer shy away from interpreting history and economics, and from showing the student how to arrive at reasonable and progressive interpretations for himself.

Men live by faith; and any positive faith, in the postwar world, will have to center in social reconstruction and control. I make that statement categorically. This is the true issue being fought out today, in the settlement of which armed victory is merely the first step.

If the colleges are to combat postwar disillusionment, then, and offer some positive faith for the individual to cling to, they will do this not by proclaiming that this is the best of all possible worlds, but by placing their curricular emphasis squarely on the present, and by helping to analyze social conditions, and working patiently to uncover the slow steps by which these conditions may be ameliorated and progress made. If life is to be livable in the future, there must be an increasingly intelligent and thoughtful social control. The individual can no longer be allowed to feel that he is caught in the cogs of a machine which he and other individuals like him are powerless to stop. Educated men and women — and plenty who are not educated — have had their share of feeling that way during the past twenty-five years. It has been, perhaps, the main spiritual malady of our time. It is up to the colleges now to show that something can be done, and that college men and women can align themselves with the constructive forces of society to do it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is also quite probable that there will be many occupational changes. One effect of the war may be the squeezing of the middle class through fixed salaries and high taxes; and the white-collar job may well decrease in attractiveness. America seems at the moment incurably white-collar and middle-class in its ideals and aspirations; but if living conditions for the working class are raised, if the war deflates many of our preconceived ideas of respectability, if there is no longer room for the bond salesman and we become a nation of government clerks and of workers — then, perhaps, the label of the A.B. or B.S. degree will seem less necessary.

It is, indeed, important to train students "how to live" in their minds and hearts by exposing them to the cultivated minds of the ages. It is equally important to realize the actual conditions under which students are going to do their living, so that their "cultivation" will not be an oasis — charming, but isolated from the shifting sands of fact. The problem for higher education is: How can students be taught to live fully, with satisfaction to themselves and the highest development of their faculties for society in the world today? It is the college's job, for instance, to teach students to appreciate Bach; but that is not all its job. How does the appreciation of Bach tie in with the individual's whole life? Should he just admire Shakespeare in an esoteric sort of way, read Proust to escape from the distressing realities of life?

I repeat, the contemporary world must be the focus of postwar college education. This does not rule out the past — on the contrary. Understanding the present means understanding the past, but it does not mean dwelling on the past for its own sake. *There* is the tremendous jump that American education has to take after the war. We may love the past, but we should not retire into it and shut the door — not because of "social duty" or outward compulsion, but because the past is never really intelligible to us unless we make it seem contemporary to us — which means discovering those elements in it that are parallel to our own society.

College curricula in the humanities area are so riddled with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

courses about the past (which are studied *as* past, not present) that this shift in emphasis from past to present will probably entail a complete curricular reorganization. If the curriculum were based upon the essential problems of contemporary society, to which illustrative material from the past could be freely applied, the problem might be solved. Of course, such a reorganization would be distressing because the immediate result of disrupting our present curriculum would be superficiality and chaos. The new arrangement would be distasteful to scholars trained in the old ways, and probably the first quarter-century would be hard going. However, I think it would be worth it.

If labels are less important after the war, we must make our college and university organization more flexible. The rigidity of the undergraduate schedule is well known, larded as it is with requirements, grades, and credit-hours; even more rigid is the schedule for graduate students. The college or university campus is not a hospitable place for people who have only limited time but a sincere desire to learn; nor does it attract older, more mature minds as casual students. Limiting "adult education" to foreign mill workers is unfortunate; and the notion that all other adults can get what they need by reading for themselves is an illusion. If colleges and universities would set up various units organized around, say, certain contemporary social problems in government, economics, history, and literature which could be taken over shorter periods by people not wanting degrees, the campus might profit greatly by the increased maturity and varying backgrounds brought to it. Degrees could still be granted in certain professional fields, such as teaching, and here the requirements could be whatever competent scholarship would suggest. But the day of universities as degree-factories may be over; and if it is, they had better begin looking for a broader base of social usefulness.

Another area of usefulness in the period of turmoil ahead lies in helping college students to make a better personal and vocational adjustment. If the "real world" of today is to be the focus of the curriculum, then the young people without experience of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the "real world" will be wandering around in a vacuum, unless they can get a look at what they are talking about. Here a "work-study" plan or an "observation" plan makes a real contribution to the vitality of the educational program. A "work-study" plan would have the further advantage of giving returning soldiers, or young people who had never worked, an opportunity to find their vocational interests and abilities in a world in which vocational adjustments are likely to be pretty hard. If such a plan is followed, vocational exploration would be carried forward through the work experience rather than the college curriculum.

A fourth way in which the postwar college may relate itself more vitally to actual social conditions is by giving students not merely the factual background and analytical approach to democracy, but also practice in democratic techniques. The "committee" as an agency of accomplishment has been laughed at since the time of Aristophanes; but the committee and the council as policy-deciding bodies are not to be laughed off. How to work with a group; how to extract from ten people, not the lowest common denominator, but the best ideas, and assemble these into the best plan of action; how to establish a working balance between the interests of the individual and the good of the group — these skills make democracy work. They are as much a part of education as geometry; training in them should begin in kindergarten and continue through college. What students need, however, is not a class in "committee techniques," but practice coupled with real responsibilities. Fortunately, campus life is not barren of opportunities here: the whole area of extracurricular living may well be organized as a community with community interests, of which both students and faculty are members. Nor should adults on campus for short-term study be excluded. Either they will contribute or they will learn.

In short, higher education of the future is going to have to be less snobbish and class-conscious. True, learning is a lifelong process, and nobody who spends six weeks taking a "social problems" course has a right to call himself "educated" in consequence. But are the bulk of our young people with A.B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or B.S. degrees "educated" either? Are they necessarily aware of the complexity of knowledge, the enormous difficulty of arriving at "true" ideas in any field of intellectual endeavor? The degree student has simply been exposed to more ideas. This does not seem a serious objection to making people six weeks wiser than they were before.

To sum up, my specific suggestions for higher education in the postwar world are:

(1) Curricular reorganization to bring the focus (not necessarily the *content*) of instruction from past to present.

(2) A more flexible organization with greatly decreased emphasis on degrees, whereby college facilities may be made available to qualified students, both young people and adults, on short-term as well as long-term bases.

(3) For young people in particular, work experience in, or at least observation of, present-day society, both to give the curriculum reality and to help them get vocationally settled.

(4) For all sojourners on the campus, young and old, students and faculty, opportunity to practice democratic methods.

What chance is there that such a program will be realized?

One of the big difficulties of American higher education during the last century is that it has followed society instead of leading it. It has dared do little that contemporary society did not sanction — witness the struggle of the physical sciences against the limits set by "revealed" religion, and the similar struggle being waged today by the social sciences against the *status quo*. A college education that is merely a respectable shadow, a timid elderly handmaiden of society, is a dispensable luxury. If these are indeed revolutionary times, the leaf has already been severed from the branch. New programs and new educational patterns will be established because they will have to be established. There is no question of the survival of higher education. There *is* grave question of the survival of many of our present institutions that apparently have not read the handwriting on the wall.

A second question is more serious. American education talks about "educating for leadership"; theoretically this is one of the main functions of an institution of higher learning — Harold Laski's notion of a democratic "élite." There would be no social

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gain in maintaining colleges and universities for the private benefit of the individual, unless some of his heightened powers flowed back into society and improved opportunities and enriched environment for all. This is actually happening, in a haphazard and limited way: many a life of wider social usefulness has been made possible by college training.

However, too few "leaders," proportionately, and too negative a "leadership" has come out of our colleges and universities — for two reasons. First, fewer than half the potential leaders ever get to college. If, on financial grounds, we systematically deny higher education to the majority of people capable of profiting by it, we are obviously cutting our chances of an educated leadership to less than 50 per cent. Here, the talked-of Federal subsidy for potential college students is one bright note for the future.

The second reason for lack of leadership from the colleges and universities is that, as we have said, higher education has been timid, afraid to draw conclusions even when it presents the facts. We have "educated" men, but too few educated men who are either willing or competent to make moral judgments. This is a serious weakness. The dictators have taught us that "intellectual objectivity" is a myth. In this world we can only select what seems the most reasonable course of action, and then *act on it.*

But even if eventually we get into the colleges most of the potential leadership material, what are we going to do with it?

Here, I submit, the answer has been given. If the curricular emphasis is changed from past to present, students are bound to emerge with more vital ideas about social directions and social values than those they are emerging with today. If the program is more flexible, so that the college can reach more people and encourage its students to come back for periodical reorientation, we can avoid the anachronism of men and women trying to reform the world by the pattern in vogue during their undergraduate years. If we teach democratic techniques on the campus, our "leaders" will learn to lead instead of sitting with folded hands waiting to be invited.

Finally, let me say a word about work experience and leadership. American higher education has tended to stratify at the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

middle-class level. Sons and daughters of middle-class homes go to college and meet sons and daughters of other middle-class homes. Taught by middle-class instructors, they are graduated and take middle-class jobs, flocking together in pleasant, middle-class suburbs. When we remember that two-thirds of the people of our nation earn less than $1,500 a year (at least in normal times), college begins to seem a very partial paradise. Worse still is the gap between the one-third who are the "leaders" and the two-thirds "led."

Actual work experience in industry, business, and social service is one way to bridge the gap. I can imagine a social system in which higher education would be completely geared into the work of the world. By apprenticeships at various jobs students would learn how less fortunate people live and think. They would learn something about human goodness and values that they would never learn in their safe, middle-class world. At the same time, business and industry would profit. "Natural" leaders in these occupations might more easily gravitate toward educational centers; and the colleges, in turn, would have to be considerably more robust to meet the exactions of men with wide experience in the world.

"Leadership" will not be accomplished through isolation. How to maintain "the best" not in seclusion, but in the rough and tumble of events — that is the problem educational institutions must solve if they are to survive in the postwar world.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Benjamin Franklin as Scientist and Citizen

I. Bernard Cohen

"There are only two powers in the world, the sword and the intellect, and in the long run the sword is always beaten by the intellect." — NAPOLEON

THE history of American science forms a cross-section of American life, cutting through the years a pattern of American intellectual achievement and social life. Our first truly great scientist is also one of our most significant political and diplomatic figures. Benjamin Franklin combined within his person the "poor boy who made good," the public servant and social organizer, the political leader, and the scientist. And his warm and generous personality set a pattern of Americanism which has marked American life, letters, and manners, ever since.

The usual portrayal of Franklin presents him as a political figure who, in his spare time, dabbled in science. His own century, on the other hand, considered him a scientist who had entered the arena of international politics, and many of his contemporaries wrote to him beseeching him to give up the illusory career of international diplomacy and domestic politics in order to return to the more "useful" career of scientific investigator.

In Franklin's own mind the relations between his scientific activities and his political career were clearly marked. For his own part, he would have preferred to remain a "Natural Philosopher," but he felt that the pursuit of science must be secondary to the national or civic welfare. Long before he became active in the public affairs of his own city, Philadelphia, much less the affairs of the nation, he wrote to a friend of his in New York: "Had Newton been pilot but of a single common ship, the finest of his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discoveries would scarce have excused, or atoned for his abandoning the helm one hour in time of danger; how much less if she carried the Fate of the Commonwealth."

These lines contain the guiding principle of Franklin's life. According to his standards, the scientist was, above all, simply a member of the community. Socially, he was like every other citizen; he was entitled to no special privileges, no exemptions from service. According to Franklin's credo, moreover, the needs of the community are always of greater importance than the needs of any single individual, be he scientist or any other kind of citizen. In time of national or civic emergency, the pursuit of pure science (the search after knowledge for its own sake), however interesting it may be, is but another cultural luxury to be given its "due weight" and no more.

Franklin began his most active period of scientific research about 1746 when he was forty years old. Until that time he had been too busy at earning his living as printer and bookseller to be able to afford much time for science. But when he was forty he had become sufficiently well-to-do to be able to retire, and he did so deliberately in order to devote himself to research in electricity, a topic with which he had just become acquainted. During the next five years, he made a series of remarkable contributions to the science of electricity, of which most of us remember only one — the demonstration of the electrical nature of lightning.

The story of the electrical kite is cherished by generations of American schoolboys, but it may truly be considered to be the least of his accomplishments in electrical science. His real contribution lay in the construction of the Franklinian theory of electricity — the first workable theory enabling scientists to account for *all* of the known phenomena of the subject and to predict new effects which were verifiable. In a series of beautiful experiments, well conceived and expertly performed, Franklin showed the world the nature of electrostatic induction, the importance of grounding and insulation in electrical experiments, and the action of the newly-discovered condenser. He discovered the fundamental properties of dielectrics and the law of conservation of charge, and he found out that pointed conductors have special

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effects in electrical discharges. This series of brilliant discoveries made him soon the acknowledged master of electrical science and gave prestige to his theory of a single electrical fluid, based on concepts expressed by "plus," "minus," "positive," "negative," "battery," and many other words which are still basic in electrical discussion, but were first used in an electrical sense in Franklin's book on electricity.

On the basis of his observation that lightning seemed to be similar to electricity, he then devised a means whereby he could show that lightning was actually electrical. The experiment in question was to be performed by a man who would stay in an insulated guard-house which would have running through it a rod which extended far into the air. This rod would terminate in a point, since pointed conductors attract electricity. It would be grounded so that the electricity would be conducted into the ground. The experimenter was to stand within the guard-house during a thunderstorm and, by means of a condenser, collect the electricity from the rod. If lightning were truly electrical, then the experimenter would be able to draw sparks from the rod and collect electricity during the lightning discharge. While Franklin was waiting for the completion of the spire on Christ Church in Philadelphia, the man who had translated into French his book on electricity successfully performed the experiment according to Franklin's instructions and broadcast to the world that "Monsieur Franklin" had been correct, that his experiment had once and for all demonstrated that the mysterious lightning is only the electricity of the laboratory operating on a grand scale. In the meanwhile, and purely as an afterthought, Franklin devised his electrical kite and confirmed his own hypothesis by this independent means.

After having discovered the principles of electricity and the nature of lightning, Franklin endeavored to make his discoveries of some use to mankind by applying his electrical principles to the invention of the lightning rod. In the middle of the nineteenth century, Joseph Henry, distinguished Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, like Franklin a discoverer of important principles of electricity, wrote of Franklin in the following terms:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By a *discovery* in science is understood the development of a knowledge of the existence of some principle in nature not before known or but partially understood; while the term *invention* indicates the application of this knowledge, either simply or in combination with other knowledge, to some useful purpose in the arts. For example, Franklin *discovered* the principle of electrical induction, or the action at a distance of a charged body on a conductor, and on this founded his *invention* of the lightning-rod.

Franklin sent accounts of his discoveries to England where they were brought to the attention of the Royal Society of London, at that time one of the leading scientific societies in the world. Their freshness and novelty recommended them immediately to the English "electricians," and these letters were introduced into the meetings of the Royal Society, applauded, and partially published in the *Philosophical Transactions,* the journal published by the Society. Flattered to hear of the success attendant on his initial scientific communications, Franklin wrote to an English correspondent in 1748: "I am pleased to hear that my electrical experiments were acceptable to the Society."

The rest of this letter was in a different vein. "Of late," he continued, "we have done but little here in that way; but possibly we may resume those enquiries this coming winter as the approaching peace gives us a prospect of being more at ease in our minds." The shadow of war had crossed the city of Philadelphia, interrupting Franklin's pursuit of pure science and precipitating a civic crisis from which Benjamin Franklin learned that the scientist is primarily and above all else a citizen.

The years 1747–48, so fruitful for Franklin's experiments, were not without their own strife and turmoil. Early in 1747 rumors had reached Philadelphia that French privateers were plotting to sack the city. Although England had been at war with Spain since 1739 and with France since 1744, the city of Philadelphia had been unmolested. Protected by their distance up the Delaware River, its citizenry had been little disturbed by enemy ships ranging the coast and had been lulled into false security and into a belief that "this is not our war." But in July of 1747, just as Franklin was finishing his second letter on electricity to his English patron, Peter Collinson, a group of French

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Spanish privateers plundered homes within twenty miles of Philadelphia and captured a ship coming to the city from Antigua, the captain of which they murdered.

Philadelphia was totally unprepared for an emergency; it had neither cannon nor ammunition, not even a militia. The Assembly, dominated by pacifist-minded Quakers, refused to appropriate any funds for "war" purposes. The very existence of the city was threatened, but the majority of the population and the governors remained calmly apathetic.

In the midst of this critical situation, Benjamin Franklin was outside the city limits, temporarily retired from local affairs in order to devote himself entirely to the pursuit of science. But he was not of the kind who could ignore the challenge of such a moment, and he willingly made himself part of a small group of far-sighted citizens who met to formulate a plan by means of which the city might be saved. It was finally agreed upon that Franklin, simply as "A Tradesman of Philadelphia," should write and publish a pamphlet which, if it were widely enough distributed, might awaken part of the population to the dangers at hand. And thus was born the first of Franklin's political tracts. Entitled *Plain Truth*, it set forth with merciless logic an analysis of the situation and the consequences which would follow a continued campaign of blind indifference. It appealed in turn to the merchants and shopkeepers, the liberal Quakers (who could support a "defensive war"), to the journeymen and laborers, to the plain citizens.

Soon a meeting of the citizens was called by Franklin and defense plans were under way at once. An "Association" was formed which raised the money necessary to buy cannon and which organized a militia. And although Franklin was the spearhead of the movement, he refused office and simply served his "turn of duty like anyone else." But the militia saw no active service, since the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, concluded in October of 1748, marked the end of possible hostilities.

In September, when it seemed already certain that the danger of invasion had passed, Franklin wrote to Cadwallader Colden, like Franklin a scientist, but Lieutenant-Governor of New York:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I . . . am taking the proper measures for obtaining leisure to enjoy life & my friends more than heretofore, having put my printing house under the care of my partner David Hall, absolutely left off bookselling, and removed to a more quiet part of the town. . . . With the same views I have refused engaging further in publick affairs. The share I had in the late Association, &c. having given me a little present run of popularity, there was a pretty general intention of chusing me a Representative for the City at the next election of Assemblymen; but I have desired all my friends who spoke to me about it, to discourage it, declaring that I should not serve if chosen. Thus you see I am in a fair way of having no other tasks than such as I shall like to give my self, and of enjoying what I look upon as a great happiness, leisure to read, study, make experiments, and converse at large with such ingenious & worthy men as are pleased to honour me with their friendship or acquaintance, on such points as may produce something for the common benefit of mankind, uninterrupted by the little care & fatigues of business.

Once the emergency was passed, Franklin believed his duty done and thought only of returning once again to his electrical experiments. He imagined that he could simply slip back unnoticed into private life. But his activity had made him too well known to remain long an "undisturbed philosopher"; though not an official, he had become a "public man." As the years went by, his civic reputation grew, and his civic responsibilities grew at the same time. After but a handful of precious years of uninterrupted scientific research — years in which he proved lightning electrical and invented the lightning rod — his public duties increased seemingly without limit until finally, as Minister Plenipotentiary to the Court of France for the Thirteen Colonies, he performed the Herculean tasks made necessary by the American Revolution.

From his letters we know that Franklin would sooner have continued his scientific career than pursue a political one, had he felt that the times would have allowed him to do so. But having a strong civic conscience and recognizing that a man's primary obligation rests with the society of which he is a member, Franklin pursued what, in terms of his values, seemed most important. Something of this compulsion can be discerned in a letter which he wrote in 1783, towards the end of his stay in Paris as Minister

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the Colonies. To a correspondent who had written to him about some of his earlier experiments, Franklin replied: "It is many years since I was engaged in those pleasing studies, and my mind is at present too much occupied with other and more important affairs to permit my returning to them." But he found it possible to head the committee appointed by the Paris Académie des Sciences to investigate the cures of Anton Mesmer, and he attended scientific meetings whenever possible.

At the height of his diplomatic career in France, Franklin wrote to Sir Joseph Banks, President of the Royal Society of London, that he hoped soon to have more leisure and that he hoped to devote a major part of it to "those studies that are more agreeable to me than political operations."

When the Revolution ended, Sir Joseph had written to Franklin: "Would I could see you abdicate the station of Legislator, and return to . . . those studies which raised you formerly to a height, less elevated perhaps, but I am sure more satisfactory." To which Franklin replied: "Be assured that I long earnestly for a return of those peaceful times, when I could sit down in sweet society with my English philosophic friends, communicating to each other new discoveries, and proposing improvements of old ones." In such company, Franklin declared, he would be happier "than in that of all the Grandees of the Earth."

When Franklin was eighty-one years of age, he believed that he might yet return to the life of a simple citizen and that, no longer burdened with the responsibilities of the public servant, he might pick up the thread of his scientific researches where he had left them some thirty years earlier. In 1785, as he was making plans for returning to America, he wrote to his most intimate scientific friend, Jan Ingen-Housz, that he was "once more a Freeman after fifty years in Public Affairs," and he hoped that his friend would be able to go to America with him where, "in the little remainder of my life . . . we will make plenty of experiments together."

But in the evening of his life there was no time for experiments. Ahead of him, as he sailed from France, were only the trying days of the Constitutional Convention and then death. And no sooner

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had Franklin got off the boat and stepped on American soil than he was chosen President of Pennsylvania.

The richness of Franklin's life and his many sided activity suggest the fullness of the man. Of all the multifarious aspects of his life, the pursuit of science was closest to his heart. Yet he forewent his scientific career willingly and became a public servant because he placed the needs of his community above his own personal and private interests. It seemed to him that his fellowmen needed his political dexterity and diplomatic ingenuity much more than his research in electricity and the other branches of Natural Philosophy. But one really complemented the other. In 1776, when Franklin went to the Court of France as Minister Plenipotentiary of the United Colonies, he was an international figure. He had written a book on electricity which had become the *vade mecum* of electrical discourse and had been published in ten editions and in four languages (five in English, three in French, one in German and one in Italian). He was a member of the two leading scientific societies of the world, the Royal Society of London and the Académie des Sciences (Paris), in addition to a host of minor learned societies. His book "bid fair to be handed down to posterity," in the words of one of his contemporaries, "as expressive of the true principles of electricity; just as the Newtonian philosophy is of the true system of Nature in general."

Few men in America at that time, and few indeed in the whole world, were as universally known and respected as Franklin was. But in his own mind, this famous savant was citizen first and scientist second. The needs of the community were always paramount. But this much is certain, that by becoming a full and actively participating member of society, he thereby became the more complete man. By fulfilling his social obligation as he saw it, he thereby achieved his full stature as a human being.

And today, rather than remembering Franklin as a great thinker or scientist, we remember him as a great man, as a great American citizen.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Plight of the American Composer

Alfred Frankenstein

CONSIDER the iron laws of supply and demand as they affect the American composer and his effort to be heard. Consider his numbers and his opportunities for outlet. In 1938 Claire Reis published her *Composers in America*, a book devoted to the lives and achievements of the outstanding native-born and naturalized creators of music at work in this country in that year. This volume treats some 204 composers in detail and provides a supplementary list of about 250 others who, in the compiler's quite catholic and unprejudiced opinion, merited some mention. Five composers who live in the community where I happen to reside — the San Francisco Bay area — are included in Mrs. Reis's survey. I personally know of at least ten more who are equally worthy of being included, and I suspect that this ratio of the mentioned and the unmentioned would hold true in other cities as well, especially since San Francisco is not and never has been particularly noteworthy as a musically creative center. One may therefore hazard a guess that in the United States today there are about 1,500 composers of respectable, serious music.

These 1,500 composers are competing with one another, with their European colleagues, and with the entire heritage of the past for a hearing by the American people. To make vivid just what this means I have tabulated the repertoire presented by the San Francisco Symphony Orchestra for the five years 1937–1941 (the last year for which complete figures were available at the time of writing) according to century, nationality, and frequency of performance. These are the results:

Forty-nine pieces of eighteenth-century music were given, three of which were played twice. Of these, 37 were by German composers, ten by Italians, and two by Frenchmen.

There were 191 performances of 151 works by nineteenth-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

century composers, 26 of which were played twice and seven three times. Eighty-nine of these were German works, 26 French, 18 Russian, 13 Italian (mostly operatic arias), two Czech, two Swedish, and one Spanish.

There were 106 performances of 96 works of the twentieth century, of which seven were played twice, two three times, and one four times. Twenty-eight of these were by Americans, 23 by French men, 12 by Russians, nine by Englishmen, eight by Finns (or rather by *the* Finn), four by Italians, four by Germans, three by Poles, two by a Mexican, two by a Spaniard, and one by a Dutchman.

There are many striking things about this repertoire, and not the least of them is the way in which the Germans, who dominate the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century offerings, lose ground in our own time. It is also remarkable, not to say spectacular, that the Americans lead the list, numerically speaking, in the twentieth century; I suspect, in fact, that this American emphasis is rather unusual and would not hold true if the orchestral repertoire for the entire country were similarly tabulated.

Looking more closely at the American repertoire one begins to perceive other and equally important facts. For one thing, not a single American work has ever been repeated by the San Francisco Symphony Orchestra, at least in its regular subscription concerts between 1937 and 1941. It is also highly noteworthy that in every instance but one — Griffes' *Pleasure Dome of Kubla Khan* — the American compositions were less than a decade old and in most cases were less than three years old. The picture, then, is of new American music constantly being tried out and constantly discarded.

Along with this, two other facts should be given equal emphasis. Only two of the 28 American works were more than ten minutes long — Roy Harris' *Third Symphony* and Daniel Gregory Mason's *Suite after English Folksongs*. And, finally, the number of composers of the stature of these two men was extraordinarily small. At least half and perhaps more of the native-grown works performed were of a conventional and rather obvious sort, and some were not worth playing at all.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From this one may draw two quite different conclusions. American composers of orchestral music, one may argue, are short-winded, largely conventional and commonplace in their ideas, and incapable of providing works that will stand the test of a second hearing. This may be true, but I am very much inclined to doubt it. If it is not true, there is only one alternative: that American orchestras are not giving the American public a true insight into American music. This I personally believe to be the case.

The conductors of every orchestra in the land are under constant pressure from native composers, from publishers, and from other interested parties and groups to perform American music. Publicity and propaganda on behalf of the American composer are the stock-in-trade of countless agencies on the right, left, and center of today's aesthetic controversies, and at least one of these organizations — the National Music Council — has taken to publishing a kind of annual box score of the orchestras with respect to the number of their American performances each season. By presenting a large number of very brief works any conductor can turn out a very satisfactory rating, according to the Council's strictly statistical standard, and can satisfy a large number of the composers and publishers who are perennially on his neck. Obviously the less difficult these works are to perform, the less time will be required in their rehearsal. Good music is not necessarily difficult or protracted, but genuinely new music is likely to cost more in effort and time than music that runs along timeworn grooves. And finally, the public takes to what it knows, at least on quick, momentary exposure, far more readily than to what it doesn't know.

In other words the important, challenging, and significant figures in American music have a very hard time getting a hearing, at least so far as symphony concerts are concerned, and the picture of American music set before the American public by its orchestras is far more remarkable for its quantity than its quality. To confuse quantity with virtue is, to be sure, a typically American vice, but it remains a confusion, and the friends of American music exemplify it in an advanced and deplorable degree.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here are several examples of what I mean. The first, appearing in *Musical America* for November 25, 1941, is taken from the column called "Mephisto's Musings":

One thing I like about Leopold Stokowski, he makes people so mad! Just now the air seems to be full of verbal brickbats as the result of his playing snippets of American works on all his programs, whether for the Philharmonic Symphony in the engagement that ended some weeks ago, or for the NBC Symphony, which he is conducting at the moment. So far as giving recognition, of a sort, to American composers is concerned, Mr. Stokowski is going beyond any of his confrères. He has trotted out something by one or another of our native sons (or adopted ones) at every concert he has given this season. But I can think of but one instance — that of Henry Cowell's *Tales of Our Countryside*, played at the Philharmonic opening and given a repetition thereafter — in which he has performed a complete American work. There have been isolated movements from symphonies, introductions, preludes and the like, which would seem to imply that the remainder of these works had not been found worthy of performance. No doubt the composers, or a majority of them, have preferred being heard fragmentarily to not being heard at all. Still, I strongly suspect that even with them there has been some little rankling within. As for me, I suppose the honest thing to say is that if I don't care very much for a piece of music I would rather hear ten minutes of it than forty. But I am inclined to agree with those who argue that a ten-minute slice from a forty-minute work is likely to give the audience the feeling that the conductor doesn't think too much of it, and that he is playing it more as a matter of "policy" than of conviction.

Evidence of a different sort is to be found in an article by John Tasker Howard published in the *New York Sun* on April 26, 1941. Mr. Howard, author of several books on American music and one of the country's foremost musical Americanists, had taken up a challenge set forth by Oscar Thompson, music editor of the *Sun*, to provide a list of American works suitable for performance during the Philharmonic Symphony's fiftieth anniversary season. Mr. Howard introduces his list with the following remarks:

Certain stipulations may help to confine the list to practicable limits. Outside of an arbitrary rule that no composer will be represented by more than one work, the fundamental requirement will be that the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

works listed shall include only those that the average concert audience will enjoy listening to, and which will presumably prove box-office attractions. We shall not ask the Philharmonic Symphony Society to be either an educational medium or a national propagandist in its centennial celebration. Hence all works of an experimental nature are eliminated, as well as those that follow radically advanced tonal patterns and structure. In other words, no shockers are admitted.

This point of view is, alas, all too prevalent among those who, like Mr. Howard, devote themselves to the cause of American music. Here, as the basic standard for what amounts to an American music festival conducted by one of the country's foremost orchestras, we have one of the most persistent, widely followed, and best-known propagandists for American music setting up conventionality, obviousness, and the capacity to please everybody, which means in the long run the capacity to please nobody. Put this back in time a little, call for the exclusion of all compositions of the past that, when new, were regarded as experimental, as examples of advanced tonal patterns and structure, or as "shockers," and you instantly eliminate practically the entire standard repertoire. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that Mr. Howard and his co-workers are devoting themselves to the cultivation of all that is unimportant in American music and tend to regard what *is* important with profound suspicion.

The mere fact, then, that American music is played does not necessarily mean anything. It particularly does not mean that in the minds of those who control the American musical scene the supremacy of the foreign composer has been relinquished. Consider, for example, the comparative ease with which refugee European composers secure performances in this country, often performances of extremely difficult and abstruse compositions.

An excellent symbol of the attitude of the overlords of American music toward the American composer as against his European colleague can be found in the announcement of the plans for the Chicago Symphony Orchestra's fiftieth anniversary season, issued by that organization early in 1940. The orchestra had commissioned new scores from seven European composers. Then

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it offered Americans a contest for works not to exceed fifteen minutes in length, and with two prizes of $500 and $300 respectively. The Europeans were not limited as to time; and while the cash value of their commissions was never made public, one may legitimately surmise that in each instance it was a good deal more than $500, since this sum barely covers the cost of having an orchestral work copied in score and parts. It was not considered necessary or desirable to grant an American commission, but it *was* considered necessary to tell the Americans when to stop. Because of protests in the press and elsewhere, this fantastic slap at the American composer was not carried out; that it was proposed at all, and that its proponents did not see that it *was* a slap, are extremely significant of what American composers have to contend with.

There are many other aspects to this problem of the American composer and his bid for a hearing, but perhaps the chief one is the scope of the standard American concert repertoire — far broader, thanks to our acceptance of interpreters of every nationality, than the standard repertoire of any other country. With Russians, Frenchmen, Englishmen, Italians, Spaniards, Germans, Finns, Rumanians, Poles, and Greeks presiding over American orchestras, we are likely to hear practically anything, and we do. Abroad, the selection of concert material is much more limited and always has been. When, for instance, Pierre Monteux played the Franck symphony at the Salzburg Festival several years ago, only the most ancient of the Viennese newspaper critics present could recall ever having a previous performance of this work. The American musical scene, then, is so cluttered up with masterpieces that the American composer with a new score under his arm is lucky if he makes his way into the concert hall by the tightest of squeezes.

Consequently, it is not at all surprising that many American composers are turning away from the established media of musical performance and are seeking new fields for the employment of their talents. These new media — the motion picture, radio, school music, and others — are important, and they will in time effect drastic and extensive changes in techniques and in aesthetic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

criteria. But consideration of them had better be postponed until a later time.

Meanwhile we have gone to war, and the effect upon our concert repertoire has been drastic and far-reaching. This is especially notable in the current season, 1942–43, wherein more significant American works are coming to performance than ever before. It is still too early to estimate the size, drift, and ultimate significance of this trend, but it is certainly there.

On the other hand, one cannot perceive any effort on the part of the powers that be to employ the talents of our important composers in the war effort itself. As Warren Allen of Stanford University has pointed out, we are too much given to thinking of music purely in terms of entertainment; that music can and should play an enormous role in military activity and in the civilian morale and propaganda program, both foreign and domestic, is only feebly realized by our military and civilian authorities; that this musical contribution should be in the hands of the ablest and best educated of our composers is not realized at all.

In this respect our government is considerably behind private industry, as witness the recent report of Harold Burris-Meyer of Stevens Institute of Technology. Burris-Meyer has studied the use of music in factories, determined what musical forms and types are valuable as aids to industrial production and what types are not, and has laid out a program for industrial music whereby the composer would work with the industrial psychologist and play as important, predictable, and controllable a part in factory management as the physician or lighting engineer. This is still in the blueprint stage, and it may result in the establishment of one of the new media mentioned above. But there are not even any blueprints for that kind of thing with reference to the war.

On the day of the famous first broadcast of the seventh symphony of Shostakovitch by Toscanini and the NBC Symphony Orchestra we in San Francisco witnessed a performance of the opera by Douglas Moore and Stephen Vincent Benét entitled *The Devil and Daniel Webster*. This work is as artful, eloquent, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effective a statement of the principles of American democracy as has ever been written. It was presented by a volunteer cast, prepared with the utmost difficulty, and put through simply because its conductor was determined to do it. He could not secure the assistance, or even the interest, of a single large-scale agency in this effort.

The contrast is symbolic of a general condition. Any American composer who set forth to do battle with a symphony 77 minutes long and scored for an enormously augmented orchestra would be quixotic, to say the least; to imagine that it would be performed at once and repeatedly and sent abroad as a fighting message of our federal government would be infinitely madder than anything ever dreamed by the Knight of the Rueful Countenance.

In other words, our serious composers are being told, either directly or by implication, to pack up their brains for the duration and leave it all to Irving Berlin.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Virtue and Talents

Jay C. Knode

IT IS seldom that the close of an historical period is signalized so dramatically as that ending with the deaths of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson on July 4, 1826. Only three days before, Major Henry Lee had written a letter to the man who was to be the next President, describing an interview with Jefferson. He was amazed, he said, at the dying man's energy, the "alacrity of his conversation," and practicularly at his attitude toward the approaching end. ". . . he spoke of it as an event rather unpleasant than terrible — like a traveller expressing his apprehension of being caught in the rain." Then, in closing, Lee intimated his belief in coming great events for Jackson. Two weeks after the death of Jefferson another letter arrived at the Hermitage. Colonel Arthur P. Hague wrote to say that he believed Clinton would "remain quiet" with respect to the Presidency and in that case "Mr. Adams and yourself are the only persons spoken of as Candidates for that station." The tide had turned and was already running full.

I

In the United States during the past century Jacksonian principles have triumphed over those of Jefferson with respect to political office, education, and many other adjuncts of our culture. Jefferson believed in a "natural aristocracy" on the grounds of "virtue and talents." The doctrine had been debated at least from the time of James Harrington, and John Adams had raised the point in a letter to Jefferson. The Virginian was careful to distinguish between natural and artificial aristocracies (the latter "founded on wealth and birth") but argued: "May we not even say, that that form of government is the best, which provides the most effectually for a pure selection of these natural *aristoi* into the offices of government?"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some fifteen years after Jefferson had penned these words Andrew Jackson, in drawing up the rough draft of his first inaugural address — which undoubtedly reflected his own thinking more accurately than the delivered speech — wrote: "Among the various and important duties that are confided to the President, there are none of more interest than that which requires the selection of his officers. . . . In the discharge of this trust it shall be my care to fill the various offices at the disposal of the executive with individuals uniting as far as possible the qualifications of the head and heart, always recollecting that in a free government the demand for moral qualities should be made superior to that of talents." With Jefferson there was a careful balancing of "virtue and talents," with Jackson the balance was tipped; the elevation of moral qualities above talents contrasts sharply with Jefferson's position. But the latter's stress upon talents must not be misunderstood. As the Beards have pointed out, he was inspired by moral forces, included them in his interpretation of history, and accepted the ethical teachings of Christianty as necessary to the good life. It should require, certainly, no great measure of perspicacity to realize that the scoundrel with superior mental capacity is potentially a more dangerous citizen than the dull-minded; on the other hand, it should be equally clear that abundance of moral qualities does not necessarily equip a man for the great tasks of leadership in society. Nevertheless, the Jacksonian point of view has prevailed to the extent that talents have been too largely driven out of public life.

II

There are at least four great transitions or movements of ideas in the history of the United States significant for the present theme. One is the evolution of American Calvinism. There has been little dispute as to the preponderance of Calvinistic doctrine in American religious thought. Entering originally through Puritanism and through the Presbyterianism of the Scottish Kirk, it affected many other sects not originally Calvinistic, notably Methodists and Baptists, and it showed a peculiar

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

affinity for the frontier. At one time, of course, Puritanism contained much English post-Elizabethan culture. But in America theological inbreeding resulted finally in the logical but terrible anti-climaxes of Jonathan Edwards, and the intellectual death-knell of Puritanism was sounded. The Calvinism of much of the early frontier and of the South came in originally through the Scotch-Irish, many of them indentured servants with backgrounds of suffering, privation, and intense hostility toward aristocracy. They had little in common with such men as John Winthrop or the Randolphs and the Byrds of Virginia.

American Calvinism carried on the Puritan doctrine of thrift, which in this country soon developed into a sanction of and urge toward acquisition, and a complete literalism, dependent upon biblical authority never to be questioned — only exactly interpreted. Reason was a dangerous exercise, except when employed in forging the chains of theology. The Deist, Jefferson, found these theological doctrines not only distasteful, but disgusting. Jackson, on the other hand, adopted certain bases of action without critical analysis. One of the sources of his power was the honesty with which he hewed to the line required by a definite point of view. He found much of the literal "eye-for-an-eye" interpretation of the Old Testament congenial, as did the early Puritans, and he shared some of the Calvinistic aversion to "reason" — which was commonly preached down to the end of the century.

A second movement was the development of English Independency into American equalitarianism. As Parrington has indicated, two fundamental rights were implied in the earlier liberal movement: a man's right to his own beliefs and his right to organize men into groups for the expression and the perpetuation of beliefs. The second of these was, of course, the more difficult to establish. But in America men like Thomas Hooker, Roger Williams, and John Wise lighted trains of thought that were to reach an explosive climax one hundred fifty years later, when minorities were to come into their own. These political doctrines, like Calvinism, were affected by contact with the frontier, and particularly by attitudes of the Scotch-Irish so fre-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quently preponderant there. In England and in New England social classes continued; on the frontier they were wiped out.

Jefferson, though reared in the hinterland of his day, was descended on his mother's side from the famous Randolph family, and became an educated and travelled gentleman. Jackson, of Scotch-Irish descent, came from what the aristocratic South called "poor white trash," was uneducated, scantily read even in the law, and never travelled beyond the borders of America. He spent much of his life under the levelling and non-intellectual influences of the frontier, and was, therefore, the natural leader of that movement whereby the old order was reversed and aristocratic sympathies became quite as much a barrier to political preferment as any democratic bias had previously been. Class distinctions in dress disappeared. The great open West for the time being provided both mental and physical release from the pressures of social gradation.

A third development to be noted is the conquest of Transcendentalism by humanitarianism. Though the New England reaction against Calvinism contained its full portion of mysticism, the element of rationalism was never lost. To be sure, its greatest spokesman read both Swedenborg and the ancient philosophies of India, yet his approach to life was fundamentally Platonic, and the Greek love of balance was a ruling influence in Emerson's life. Ignorant people sometimes talk as if there were no "thrill" (assuming we must use this word to make ourselves understood) in the intellectual life. It is common knowledge that science in Emerson's day was opening up new vistas in time, space, and life even beyond those perceived by the intellectual pioneers of the preceding century. When the concept of "evolution" began to take shape, before Darwin and Wallace put the word upon everybody's tongue, men like Agassiz hedged and faltered. Men like Emerson — following in the footsteps of the Socini and Giordano Bruno, intoxicated by the vision of the new universe three hundred years before — welcomed these startling ideas. They found them not only capable of impelling reverence, but full of new implications as to human greatness. The fact that man emerged from and could call an infinite universe his heri-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tage did not thrust them into fits of depression as it has some of our modern thinkers.

Emerson was a reformer; he criticized forthrightly many of the thoroughly "respectable" practices of the day. But there was always restraint in his attacks. He was different from his neighbor, Bronson Alcott, with his naïvely organized Fruitlands, different from William Lloyd Garrison, and different from a very important later reformer who wrote (in the third person) of a portion of her masterpiece: "The first part of the book ever committed to writing was the death of Uncle Tom. This scene presented itself almost as a tangible vision in her mind while sitting at the communion table in the little church in Brunswick. She was perfectly overcome by it and could scarcely restrain the convulsion of tears and sobbings that shook her frame."

It was a period of emotional releases — political campaigns roiled by the most intense personal conflict and vilification, and camp-meeting orgies that sometimes brought the wrong kind of notoriety — but accompanied by beneficial reforms. People became sensitive to the horrors of public executions, the abuse of insane persons, the injustices of imprisonment for debt, the deprivations of children with respect to education. And, in this connection, it is interesting to note that Horace Mann was responsible for the enactment of three reform measures in Massachusetts not related to education: one against the use of alcoholic beverages, another against traffic in lottery tickets, and a third establishing state hospitals for the insane. Any movement that appealed to the "heart" had large audience and large chance of success. On the other hand, the Calvinism of the day fought science and the visions of men like Emerson tooth and nail, and that attitude has survived to the present time through laws in some of our commonwealths forbidding free inference from scientific findings.

Andrew Jackson was in no way responsible, of course, for the emotional bias of his time; he merely expressed the feeling around him, and he did not discriminate. Lewis Mumford has contrasted a product of that environment with one of an earlier thus:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In order to appreciate the distance between the America of the eighteenth century, which was still attached umbilically to the older Europe, and the America of the pioneer, tinctured by the puritan and the industrialist, one might perhaps compare two representative men, Thomas Jefferson and Mark Twain. When Mark Twain went to Europe during the Gilded Age, he was really an innocent abroad: his experience in "roughing it" had not fitted him for any sort of seasoned contact with climates, councils, governments. When Jefferson went to Paris from the backwoods of Virginia, a hundred years earlier, he was a cultivated man, walking among his peers. . . .

The truth is that the life of the pioneer was bare and insufficient: he did not really face Nature, he merely evaded society. Divorced from its social context, his experience became meaningless.

Literalism and emotionalism are always nonrational, often antirational.

Finally, the Jacksonian outlook triumphed over Jeffersonianism through the glorification of industry and technology. It is well known that toward the end of his career Jefferson qualified his expressed aversion to industrial enterprise. He never completely surrendered his agrarian bias, but he saw some of its limitations. Jackson, too, as a result more of unhappy personal losses than of a reasoned conclusion, hated big aggregations of capital. But the frontier — Jackson's frontier — was hostile to any limitation upon the acquisitive activities of the ambitious poor man, especially as he established himself in the West. It was, and was to remain, the Golden West. Men did not realize the relationship between such a point of view and such aggregations until confronted by the extravagances of the Gilded Age and the "saturation" of the frontier.

Some of this sentimentalism still throws an aura of the romantic over the Old West and its famous trails, gold-fields, ranches, and railroads. But the same romanticism has accompanied invention and big business. Every labor-saving device, every oil well, every new smelter, has presumably brought the Golden Age a step nearer. Even today fervor and "uplift" pervade certain phases of commercial evangelism, and a famous West-Coast business "college" can write in its prospectus:

Think of the romance of Business! There is no other field of human

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

endeavor that appeals so irresistibly to the imagination. . . . Business offers more thrills than the most exciting sport, and the intensity of interest never wanes. No previous generation ever had such magnificent opportunities for thrills as has this generation. Why, the battlefields of old, with their armored knights, were tame in comparison with the battle business is waging. Indeed, the joy of romance and adventure is just dawning . . . *for you.*

Technology has been developed largely by the profession of engineering, which makes honesty and exactness fundamental in its teaching. But often the technologist does not display outside the area of his own specialization some of the most important qualities associated with the scientific attitude: e.g., "intellectual unconventionality," "indifference to current prestige," "criticism of logical processes," "suspension of judgment," and "possession of significant information." These are qualities that follow mental rather than moral leadership, but they may have profound moral results.

III

Mrs. Samuel Harrison Smith in her *First Forty Years of Washington Society* said of Jefferson's external appearance that it had "no pretensions to elegance, but it was neither coarse nor awkward, and it must be owned his greatest personal attraction was a countenance beaming with benevolence and intelligence. . . . Mr. Jefferson was known in Europe as much, if not more, as a philosopher, than as a politician." The third President was not a great administrator. He did not regard his terms as Governor and as President worthy even of mention in his famous epitaph, but his activities were not confined to social theorizing. He had no ability as a public speaker, yet he was a capable politician. He inaugurated and prosecuted many projects — sometimes failing, sometimes succeeding after years of effort — but he was always concerned with outcomes. He possessed tremendous energy, particularly for study and writing, and his genius for friendship helped to make him famous. At the same time, Jefferson was most deeply interested in rights, principles, and ideas, and in their definition and expression.

Conversely, Jackson, while a man of high intelligence, was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

always, first, the man of action. He was no student, no theorist, but a superb organizer. As a face-to-face leader of men, of the type Giddings called "dogmatic-emotional," he could perform feats of endurance, pursue endless details, and overcome obstacles in a manner that evoked both fear and devotion. Jackson, like Jefferson, was often the finest of friends, but he had a fierce self-assertiveness. He could and did kill men who insulted him or his family. Even when President and sixty-six years old he wrote, following the attempt of a dismissed army officer to strike him, that if he had been informed of the man's approach, "I would have been prepared and upon my feet, when he never would have moved with life from the tracks he stood in." After all, these are traits that all men can understand; they fascinate the masses, and inspire faith in the hero's ability to achieve any objective whatsoever. On the other hand, the highest expressions of ideas and ideals, if rational and literary, though they may be regarded with a measure of respect, or even of awe, call forth no spontaneous crowd response.

Probably there is no sphere in which a man's philosophy can be more clearly traced than in his ideas relative to education. "A philosophy of education is first cousin to a philosophy of life." Jefferson's concern about it throughout his career has frequently been recounted. As early as 1779 he proposed the establishment of primary and secondary schools and reorganization of the College of William and Mary. As between universal education on lower levels and education of higher order he would have chosen the former, but he did not anticipate need for such a choice. He would have given all children in his ideal system the opportunity of obtaining the rudiments of learning at public expense, but, above the beginning level, children were to be selected for advancement. This process was to go on until only those "of the best Genius" were to obtain higher education while supported by public funds. He was truly the "father" of the University of Virginia — its architect and the overseer of its construction, designer of its course of study, of plans for the admission of students, their government and graduation, and for the employment of the faculty. To one of his English corres-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pondents he wrote: "This institution will be based on the illimitable freedom of the human mind. For here we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate any error so long as reason is left free to combat it." Where is there a finer statement of the right of academic freedom?

Toward education Jackson, also, apparently had only friendliness, though he had little contact with its institutions, and knew little of its processes. In 1826 he addressed a letter to General Plauché and others at New Orleans asking for financial aid in establishing fellowships in Nashville College — one of which was to be named after Jackson — and began: "I take the liberty to address you upon a subject on which I feel great interest, as it is one with which, I know the welfare and happiness of our country to be intimately connected. It relates to the blessings of education which, without doubt, constitute the chief support of the liberties which our forefathers have bequeathed to us." In the rough draft of his first inaugural address, before mentioned, he wrote that the "Representative principle" upon which our government is based "can reach its *maximum* value, only by a wide and efficacious diffusion of instruction — knowledge and power being in this respect coexistent qualities." And he confirmed this friendliness in private letters.

Though Andrew Jackson would have been a difficult pupil in any school and though his religion did not restrain him from prodigious profanity or personal revenge, both education and Calvinism were articles of his faith, parts of his creed. The emphasis, however, must be put upon the word *creed;* Jackson never came to reasoned conclusions about these things. They provided equipment for living, were values taken for granted; and his public utterances in this vein smacked a bit of formula-repetition. Besides, the movement of which he was spokesman demanded insistently the sharing of all former aristocratic privileges, including education.

IV

In *Education Between Two Worlds* Alexander Meiklejohn has contrasted the educational ideals of John Amos Comenius with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those of John Locke. The former, believing in the unity of knowledge and the unity of mankind, set up three goals for education: learning, virtue, and piety. In Locke's scheme, however, knowledge was not only secondary, but in large measure irrelevant. It is to be attained after the pupil has "first made careful provision for physical health, for virtue, for piety, for worldly wisdom, for good breeding, and for reputation, as essentials of education." It must be, in Locke's own phrase, "subservient to greater qualities." One is led to speculate somewhat wistfully with Meiklejohn upon the possible outcomes in English and American life, had Comenius' plan been adopted when he was invited to present it in London 300 years ago.

This same contrast of emphasis appears in the views of Jefferson and Jackson. It is a difference that always interposes itself between the man of learning and the "practical" man. Unhappily, the latter, distrusting reason and learning, turns for guidance to his feeling. When the rigidity of Puritanic allegiance to duty and the balanced Jeffersonian doctrine of intellectual integrity both lost potency in the American *milieu* of Jackson's day, moral decisions yielded increasingly to sentimentalism. And sentimentality easily deteriorates into rascality by way of rationalization. Before the lures of expansion, of acquisition, of power, and of comfort, a "conscience" that neither Jefferson nor Roger Williams would have countenanced found acceptance. And some of the grotesque results were carried past the gilded seventies and eighties into the present. Political, economic, and educational leadership operating under such a mode of judgment grows farcical. Any public demand becomes a public right, while, on the other hand, public estimate of the value of any man, any product, any proposition becomes the unstable outcome of raucous publicity. Votes may be gathered by means of hill-billy bands and "pass-the-biscuit" vaudeville. Glamor and thrill may outweigh honesty and dignity and knowledge. All education — even higher education — may develop tendencies toward becoming a great game, dedicated first to individual whim and finally to public spectacle.

In the United States of today the values of business are still

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in ascendancy over the values of learning. And the criterion of leadership is still moral rather than intellectual. Nothing irritates the dominant business class more than the accession to political power of an intellectual leader. With a background of English middle-class Puritanism, American Calvinism, and American frontier life the distrust of the things of the mind not only survives, but continues to grow, because the leadership of our public school system has almost completely surrendered itself to this dominance. For the last twenty-five years teachers' colleges have shown more concern about training school superintendents (who in most instances wield dictatorial power in their systems) in the methods of business than in developing them for educational statesmanship. Further, comparison of a recent *Who's Who* with one issued twenty-five years ago shows the degree to which a similar influence has penetrated our publicly controlled institutions of higher learning. Among the presidents of state universities the proportion of those with training and teaching experience in the social sciences has remained about the same; but the proportion of those trained in the humanities has shrunk from approximately 33 to 8 per cent; in mathematics and science, from approximately 28 to 13 per cent. On the other hand, presidents with professional training have increased from 11 to 48 per cent of their respective groups in twenty-five years, and now represent professions as varied as engineering, education, mining, agriculture, law, business administration, and military science. The American public trusts and respects the technologist more than the pure scientist as an administrator; the lawyer, the engineer, or the "educationist" more than the humanist. That is, apparently the public considers the administrative phases of the work of a university president more important than the intellectual leadership involved. One is constrained to ask how far this will go under the added pressures of modern war.

However, a critical attitude toward trends and outcomes is growing. Not long ago, in the survey of a group who had attended a large American University, part of the conclusion read:

> As we examined the personal life of these 951 young adults we said that the goals and life satisfactions that most of them had set for them-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves were self-centered, focused chiefly on a desire for security and happiness at home and on the job. We found that they were not much concerned about philosophy or religion, and they were content with this lack of concern. We discovered that a minority of them evinced emotional tendencies toward reticence and lethargy. And we concluded that their leisure-time activities were almost entirely passive, rarely creative or active.

The report of the American Youth Commission in 1942 made two significant recommendations: that high school students be taught how to read and how to work. Even some of the greatest modern reformers of education have revolted from the extremes of individualism and practicality to which their followers have gone. John Dewey has said:

> Schools farthest to the left (and there are many parents who share the fallacy) carry the thing they call freedom to the point of anarchy. Ultimately it is the absence of intellectual control through significant subject-matter which stimulates the deplorable egotism, cockiness, impertinence, and disregard for the rights of others apparently considered by some persons to be the inevitable accompaniment, if not the essence of freedom.

And Boyd H. Bode has struck the same note:

> The insistence that we must stick uncompromisingly at all times to the "needs" of childhood has bred a spirit of anti-intellectualism which is reflected in the reliance upon improvising instead of long-range organization, in the over-emphasis of the here and now, in the indiscriminate tirades against "subjects," in the absurdities of pupil planning, and in the lack of continuity in the educational program.

Real intellectual fare is stern stuff. Thomas Jefferson held that the scholar's day should be fifteen hours long, and he regarded familiarity with the highways of the mind as a life-long quest essential to all true leadership. College officials observe every year the tragic outcome of vicious mental habits deriving directly from the pursuit of faulty educational objectives. Often when they scold about ignorance of multiplication tables or the spelling of common words, they are consigned to the limbo of poor cavilers who see nothing in education but its *minutiae*. Their educational critics miss the point. The scolders find in such a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

condition the result of careless and callow intellectual life. There is, if you please, a moral element involved. Indeed, true intellectual life can never be emptied of moral content. Will to mastery, self-sacrifice, self-forgetfulness, tolerance, honesty, devotion to duty are all implicit in the life of the true scholar and they carry over to student life. All this does not mean that education must revert to deadly routine or vapid abstractions; it does mean that the intellectual content must be restored, and that in higher education that content must become and remain predominant.

Savage peoples live in contact with things, a few people, and a very few stereotyped ideas. Civilization has grown through the multiplication of ideas. Whenever we neglect them or the conditions necessary for their free propagation we endanger civilization. On the other hand, to pursue ideas without sufficient emphasis upon people and things may make for a kind of rarefication that spells only nonsense. We need balance. And this is especially true for leaders in those realms designated in Jefferson's phrase as "the instruction, the trusts, and government of society." It is certain that few Americans would care to dispense with the major effects of the "Jacksonian Revolution." It introduced some of the movements that most truly distinguish American life. At the same time there were distinctly deleterious by-products which have had increasing influence in the course of the century elapsed. Among them was an undue deferment to mass sentiment. The common man's *judgment* is the foundation of democracy. Into it, however, the exercise of all his talents must enter. He must be informed, and he must be trained in distinguishing facts from fancies, logic from loquacity. The instruction, the trusts, and the government of society will never be safe until the people take balanced account of both virtue and talents.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN THE WORKSHOP

Mathematics and the War

R. G. D. Richardson

BEGINNING in September 1939, when war was declared in Europe, competent committees appointed by the mathematical societies have devoted much effort to planning the utilization of our national mathematical resources. First and foremost stands the teaching of mathematics to the men preparing for the armed forces. This in many cases involves considerable adaptation of mathematical material to the special needs of groups in the army and navy. During the past three years colleges and high schools have been brought to the point of emphasizing the aspects of mathematics which are basic to physics and engineering; this is on the whole a healthy trend. As a consequence of the greatly increased amount of mathematics being taught, there is a dearth of instructors in this important sector of science.

The second great endeavor is the cultivation of research in the mathematics fundamental to mechanical and electrical engineering as applied to the new devices which are helping to shorten the war. As well known examples, we may cite the prompt overcoming of the danger of magnetic mines through degaussing, the perfection of new electronic instruments, and the development of acoustical devices for submarine detection. An interesting concomitant of these new attitudes is the increased appreciation by the general public of the rôle of mathematics.

The Teaching of Mathematics. Everyone now knows that a considerable proportion of the enlisted men must have a knowledge of the elements of geometry and algebra and that candidates for officer training must, as a minimum, be versed in trigonometry. The modern way of living involves complexities never dreamed of a generation ago, and these often depend on physics which in turn depends on mathematics. War shares with industry this increased complexity; in fact, it has itself contributed an impetus to many developments such as radar, which is one striking application of mathematical physics.

The condition of marked weakness in mathematical knowledge on the part of many high school graduates, unearthed by the navy and army, is not news to mathematicians, though it may be to the general public. The doctrine that nothing involving rigorous intellectual discipline should be required in the high school has had a debilitating effect. The universities have been responsible for letting this canker grow under their auspices;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they are likely to be too supine to take the necessary drastic measures to ameliorate the situation. Teachers of mathematics themselves are to some extent to blame since very often they have been content to teach the form without inculcating the spirit.

Mathematical Research for the War. An astonishingly large number of persons who have been working in the most abstract parts of mathematics have shifted their attention to problems assigned to them by the army, navy, and war industries.

Advocates of the Kilgore Bill now pending in Washington, the stated object of which is to mobilize scientific and technological research, claim that science is poorly organized for assistance to the war effort and that altogether too small a fraction of scientists is enlisted. On the other hand, William L. Lawrence, writing in the *New York Times* for January 3, 1943, stated that 87 per cent of the mathematicians engaged in research have turned their attention to war work. The truth of the matter probably lies between these two given extremes.

Mathematics is serving valiantly the spectacular developments taking place in war endeavors. Problems in ballistics are enlisting groups of mathematicians at Aberdeen Proving Ground and elsewhere; radio research makes its calls to the Radiation Laboratory and to other centers; the Taylor Model Basin is concerned with mathematical problems in ship construction; Langley Field has enlisted a number of men to work on urgent questions in aeronautics; this list could be greatly expanded.

The war effort will probably give a new impetus to all kinds of mathematical research throughout the world. This prediction is borne out by the splendid achievements in both pure and applied mathematics to be witnessed in Russia in the midst of the most gigantic struggle in history. Research significant enough to win a Stalin Prize has been done in the trenches. China, also, in her desperate position, has found means to inaugurate a new scientific journal publishing excellent papers in the most abstract mathematics. What the effect will be in Germany it would be futile to speculate; but there continues to be a vigorous prosecution of research with special attention to the applications to war. No one can say what will be the long-time effect in America, but there have been already striking short-time results. One measure of the increased emphasis on the applications here in America is the inauguration of a new journal, *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics*, in connection with the program of Advanced Instruction and Research in Mechanics at Brown University.

Deficiencies in the Applications. America has been woefully deficient in the advanced aspects of some sectors of applied mathematics. American engineering in many of its aspects has achieved a high level of performance. In physics and in astronomy America has built instruments and achieved results that are the marvel of the world. However, America has had to rely, and still is relying largely, on foreign countries to build up the scientific foundations on which many

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the advances in our mechanical engineering rest.

This is surprising, too, because American research before 1890 was weighted toward the applications. Gibbs, the greatest of American scientists, with his epoch-making theories which form the bases for much of modern physical chemistry; Newcomb in mathematics and astronomy — in his day the best known of American scientists internationally; G. W. Hill, in mathematical astronomy, who brought renown to this country: it would seem that these products of American scholarship might well have influenced American mathematics to proceed in quite another direction from that which it actually took.

Difficulties to be Overcome. In order that the nation may forge ahead in war or in peace, there is need for a more extensive cultivation of the theoretical aspects of some branches of mechanical and electrical engineering. But the American public is suspicious of theory. It has relied on the practical and experimental methods for solving problems; we see this in government as well as in engineering. In a democracy this attitude is attended with grave dangers; it does not have within itself the seed for its own correction. Some extraordinary means must be found to bring the necessities of the case home to those with influence; the war may make this more feasible.

Psychiatry and the War

George S. Stevenson

IN SPITE of the fact that war itself is a clash of ideologies and behavior of people and depends for success on the most effective functioning of soldier and civilian, disturbances of mental health have in the past been ignored or condoned to the point where in 1918 General Pershing had to cable home: "Prevalence of mental disorders in replacement troops recently received suggests urgent importance of intensive efforts in eliminating mentally unfit from organization of the new draft prior to departure from the United States."

The burden of tradition is such that, in spite of this warning clearly written into the official record, the same appeal has had to be repeated in this war because two essentials to good psychiatric selection — adequate time and adequate history — have not been assured. The tradition of medical examination has the doctor making a personal examination of a patient in the examining room, but under present limitations of personnel it has been possible for the psychiatrist to devote no more than three to five minutes for such examinations. Traditionally in medicine a history is supplementary data. For psychiatry, however, history is one of the focal methods of examining a patient.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The best indication of how a man will behave is how he has behaved.

Retrospective studies of men who have broken down in the service show clearly that the breakdown might have been anticipated in perhaps two-thirds of the cases had the historical evidence been secured routinely. States that have established this routine have mobilized large numbers of volunteer trained social workers who are giving a few hours a week, in addition to their regular work. This is bound to have far-reaching effects on the public appreciation of psychiatric problems and to be of value in demobilization and rehabilitation after the war is won and soldiers return.

Next to good selection the problems of mental health of the armed forces are best met by early diagnosis and treatment. Artificial distinctions between the sick and the able-bodied are such that admission to a hospital for the treatment of a mental disability is often a mere prelude to discharge. Early symptoms that might have given a warning are too frequently considered not as symptoms but rather as problems of discipline or ineptness. Experience of the past twenty-five years has taught us to pay heed to these early warnings, and in the armed forces the chaplains, company officers, instructors, and others are beginning to give these symptoms similar consideration.

Of great significance is the use in these clinics of the male psychiatric social worker who is already in the service and who is in a position to extend the psychiatric aid beyond the traditional office contact. The service developed at the Signal Corps Replacement Training Center at Fort Monmouth under Brig. General Edgar L. Clewell is a most highly developed example.

During the past fifteen years much evidence has been adduced, showing that some medical disorders (gastric ulcer, high blood pressure, irritable heart, asthma, some skin infections) previously considered wholly organic tend to have a high and often major mental component. In spite of the recency of this knowledge, it has gained a promising foothold in the armed forces and constitutes a warning of increased responsibility on the general practitioner and the medical school.

In other ways, too, psychiatric diagnosis is being modified or is modifying traditional experience. Malingering is often now recognized as not a simple faking of disability by an otherwise sound and potentially good soldier. More often than not the malingerer is psychopathic to a degree that would disqualify him in any case.

The supply of psychiatrists is all too inadequate to meet the demands that have arisen with the armed forces. Many psychiatrists are little acquainted with milder psychiatric cases that are not seen in hospitals. Efforts are under way to give them special training in this and to conserve their resources by using group methods of treatment and education.

It is obvious that the great demands for psychiatrists in the service and the demands for manpower in industry draw heavily upon our professional and attendant personnel of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mental hospitals. A 60 per cent loss of doctors is not infrequent and immense losses of attendants are only partly met by new employees, who, in addition to being fewer, are untrained, and training facilities have also been depleted. Under such conditions accidents are unavoidable and retributive attacks on hospitals whose standards have thus been lowered makes it even more difficult for them to hold their remaining staff. Some relief has been obtained by the use of conscientious objectors, but this, too, has been blocked on occasion by misguided "patriotic" opposition.

For the young physician entering the field of psychiatry all of this is a sign that he is entering an undeveloped field and has extensive opportunities before him for an important contribution to human living.

George William Hill

Eric Berger

ONE of the highlights in the rich and busy life of Dr. John Finley, educator, former editor of the *New York Times*, and lover of walking, was an invitation to lecture at the Sorbonne. At the farewell dinner which marked Dr. Finley's return to the United States, Raymond Poincaré, President of France and cousin of the French mathematician Henri Poincaré, was principal speaker.

At the conclusion of his talk, Poincaré remarked:

"I want to thank you not only because you are an American, and not only because of your splendid record of scholastic achievement, but because you are a compatriot of that immortal genius, George William Hill."

Dr. Finley acknowledged the polite applause and expressed his thanks. But he carefully avoided any reference to George William Hill. Dr. Finley had never heard of Hill.

When he returned to the United States, Dr. Finley found that George William Hill was an American mathematician who had made a notable contribution to the mathematical astronomy of the past century. In the hands of Henri Poincaré, Hill's theories had greatly changed science's approach to the study of the motions of three mutually attracting bodies.

Hill died in 1914 at the age of 76. He had been one-time president of the American Mathematical Society, had been awarded the Copley medal of the Royal Society of London in 1909. The four-volume edition of Hill's collected works carries a preface by Henri Poincaré. Hill was an authentic American genius.

From 1898 to 1901, Hill had lectured at Columbia University. Characteristically, he returned his salary to the university authorities, explaining that he did not need the money, that it bothered him to be burdened with the arithmetic of handling the honorarium.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR READERS COMMENT

On "Theater for the Common Man"

To the Editor: "Theater for the Common Man," in the Summer issue of THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR, leaves me puzzled as to whether the author is advocating the desirable or forecasting the inevitable. It is true that students of today, even in large cities where good plays are accessible and balcony seats can be purchased by anyone willing to forego three or four motion pictures to save the money, seldom or never attend a stage play. To bring the stage play physically to the audience in places where it is not now accessible is merely a prerequisite to a solution of the problem; it is not, as the author admits, a solution in itself. What puzzles me is that, having insisted on the unique contribution of stage drama as a reason for its continuance in spite of the popularity of screen and radio drama, he seems to advocate abandoning the uniqueness in order to achieve the popularity. If stage drama can be brought to the common man only by aping the qualities of its rivals, there seems to be no good reason why it should be brought to him at all. Unless it has some deeper significance, as an art form, than the mere presence of actors and audience in the same room, it may as well be allowed to die out. The point is that it does have that significance; that it is one not at present shared by screen and radio drama; and that it is a significance of the highest importance to the common man, whether he is aware of it or not. I watched for some clear statement of what this unique contribution of stage drama really is, and I did not find it.

It is not enough for a play to be "related" to life. To be of any use as art, it must interpret life in such a way as not to falsify its values. It must present human character and human relationships, in whatever environment the play may chance to portray, as the complex and challenging realities that they actually are, and must show human problems as something to be decided by hard-working human intelligence. People who go to the theater in preference to the motion pictures do so for the same reason that moves people who read THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR in preference to *The Reader's Digest.* They wish to be made to think.

The person who needs to be made to do his own thinking is precisely the common man. Stage drama need not flee from the sophisticate into the arms of the moron in order to survive; most theater-goers, actual and potential, come in somewhere between the two extremes. We don't do a great deal of thinking unless somebody makes us do it; but under the guidance of serious stage drama we can and do acquire a taste for thinking. To large numbers of people the stimulus to thought afforded by great books or by wise and gracious teaching is limited by the circumstances of daily life and by long dependence upon the direct visual and auditory appeal of the motion pictures. Stage drama, having that direct approach to the mind of the common man, must purchase its own survival by giving him the valid presentation of life which he does not get in other forms of drama. By all means, put the price of tickets within his reach; but keep the contribution of the theater unique. Survival on any other terms is something less than honest.

HAZEL B. POOLE
Orange, N. J.

On "Liberal Socialism"

To the Editor: The gravest error in Mr. Lackner's analysis of the postwar German government, lies in his concluding paragraph. Here he states that the slogan of "Liberal Socialism will take." On the mere basis of a shibboleth, the future of Germany will be settled.

There have been many times in the past that catchwords have been offered people; used to lead them, as well as to betray them. Mr. Lackner intends to lead them with "Liberal Socialism." A program of words is merely that — just words. We must implement words with deeds, plans, and programs. This discussion Mr. Lackner avoids; and justly so. It is much too complicated.

Just what is "Liberal Socialism"? Democracy has a different meaning to 130,000,000 Americans. They can barely agree on the general principles. How then will "Liberal Socialism" aid the Germans; what do they understand as "Liberal Socialism"; and what is our conception of the term?

The proposal for a political system for Germany leads us into other fields. Will the Allied

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nations make similar suggestions for the other defeated countries?

At the end of the war we will not only decide the terms of the peace, but on what terms the new governments will be set up. Will the people of the defeated nations have a complete hand in the determination of their respective governments, or will the victors make some distinct choice for them, or grant them some alternatives? What if the defeated choose a government that is the antithesis of our beliefs? This is not wholly beyond the realm of possibility, especially in the case of Germany. Will we deprive that government of the right to exist? If we do, the doctrine of self-determination must collapse.

It is apparent that at the conclusion of the war, there will be some form of eclectic governmental organization set up for *all* the nations of the world. This will not be uniform throughout, since it will take into consideration the cultural levels of the different countries of the world, but it will have some definite shape and aim. The Americas will tend to some form of Socialistic control, while the Russians will no doubt grant much more freedom of expression and initiative. The world will be composed of these governments in order to attain the goal of international good-will and economic cooperation. Russia, it will be recalled, withdrew from world trade before the war. The new nations that will be formed will no doubt take the form of the eclectic government — a Socialistic Democracy containing the Jeffersonian principles of democracy, and the Neo-Marxian principles of Russian Socialism.

LOUIS SAPIR
Bronx, N. Y.

Our Authors

HENRY MARTIN MOOLMAN, of Dutch descent, was born in Cape Province, South Africa, and is a graduate of the University of South Africa. As parliamentary and political correspondent in Cape Town for the *Argus* newspapers, he travelled extensively on political tours with General Smuts and other Ministers. In 1938 Mr. Moolman was appointed Public Relations officer for the Union Government, holding that post until 1942 when he came to Washington to organize a South African Government Information Office and to represent South Africa on the United Nations Information Board.

HANS KOHN became a contributor to THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR in the fall of its first year and

HAVE YOU DISCOVERED

Kierkegaard?

Of course you know his name, but have you *read* him? Søren Kierkegaard has been soberly compared to Socrates, Pascal, Nietzsche, Tolstoy, Augustine, Freud, Tertullian, and William James (to give only part of the list).

TIME MAGAZINE: "Had this philosopher and mystic not written in a minor language, his fame would have resounded with that of Carlyle, Nietzsche, and Dostoievski."

MIGUEL UNAMUNO: "I learned the language in order to read Ibsen and was rewarded by reading Kierkegaard."

REINHOLD NIEBUHR: "The profoundest interpreter of the psychology of the religious life, in my opinion, since St. Augustine."

COMMONWEAL: "The greatest Protestant Christian of the nineteenth century, a man equal in spiritual stature to Cardinal Newman."

CHRISTIAN CENTURY: "Kierkegaard has inspired all those philosophers and theologians of the recent past who have concerned themselves with the doctrine of man."

These are the ten Princeton Kierkegaard publications:

PHILOSOPHICAL FRAGMENTS, translated by David F. Swenson. {Published for American-Scandinavian Foundation.} $2.00

STAGES ON LIFE'S WAY, translated by Walter Lowrie. $6.00

CONCLUDING UNSCIENTIFIC POSTSCRIPT, translated by David F. Swenson and Walter Lowrie. {Published for American-Scandinavian Foundation.} $6.00

THE SICKNESS UNTO DEATH, translated by Walter Lowrie. $2.75

REPETITION, translated by Walter Lowrie {with a bibliographical essay, "How Kierkegaard Got into English".} $2.75

FEAR AND TREMBLING, translated by Walter Lowrie. $2.75

EITHER/OR, translated by David F. Swenson, Lillian M. Swenson, and Walter Lowrie. 2 vols. {Publication late fall 1943.} $7.50

THE CONCEPT OF DREAD, translated by Walter Lowrie. {Publication spring 1944.}

THE ATTACK ON "CHRISTENDOM," translated by Walter Lowrie. {Publication spring 1944.}

A SHORT LIFE OF KIERKEGAARD, by Walter Lowrie. $2.75

Order from your bookseller or from
THE PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
Princeton, New Jersey

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the magazine has published his articles almost biannually since that time. He was born in Prague but has lived in many countries — Russia, Palestine, France, England — and since 1934 has been a professor of modern history at Smith College. Equally distinguished as lecturer and writer, he has become particularly well known for his studies in the history of nationalism.

A graduate of the University of Iowa, DARREL ABEL is now an instructor in English at Purdue University. THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR essay on literary criticism has been preceded mainly by creative writing, including a master's thesis composed of a group of original lyrics.

NELL K. A. FOSTER spent her "adolescent years in continental Europe studying music and foreign languages." She is the wife of Henry Clay Foster, writer and naturalist, and makes translations to aid in his research.

Now a professor in the School of Economics and Politics at the Institute for Advanced Study, EDWARD MEAD EARLE was formerly associate professor of history at Columbia University. In addition to his academic duties, Dr. Earle serves also as special consultant to the Army Air Forces. His article, "Friedrich List, Forerunner of Pan-Germanism," is based on a chapter from *Makers of Modern Strategy*, edited by Professor Earle with the collaboration of Gordon A. Craig and Felix Gilbert, Princeton University Press, October 18, 1943.

After serving as an instructor in psychology at Harvard, FRANK A. PATTIE came to Rice Institute where he is now assistant professor of psychology. He became interested in hypnosis while a student of the late William McDougall at Harvard. At present Mr. Pattie is conducting an experiment "designed to throw some light on the theory of stuttering."

EDWARD M. MILLER, a native of Oregon and a graduate of the University of Oregon, is Sunday and feature editor of *The Oregonian*. Last year, as a Fellow of the Nieman Foundation, Mr. Miller and his family spent the year 1941–42 in New England and took exploratory trips to many Meccas along the Atlantic seaboard — such as Miami, "which is worse than Hollywood."

Businessman, as well as educator, ALGO D. HENDERSON is president of Antioch College and the Antioch Shoe Project, Incorporated. His efforts to bring higher education into close relationship with daily living have been reflected in Antioch's unique work-study program. President Henderson's first book, *Vitalizing Liberal Education*, is to be published by Harper's this fall.

I. BERNARD COHEN is instructor in physics at the Jefferson Physical Laboratory, Harvard, and is a Fellow of the Carnegie Institution of Washington in the history of science. He is the editor of the only edition of Benjamin Franklin's book on electricity to be issued since Franklin's death and the first to be published in America. Mr. Cohen was introduced to THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR readers in the Summer of 1942 through his article, "Newton and the Modern World."

Music and art editor of *The San Francisco Chronicle*, ALFRED FRANKENSTEIN is also a member of the faculty of the University of California Extension Division and a program annotator for the San Franciso Symphony Orchestra. He has been a guest instructor at Stanford University and Mills College and a contributor to leading magazines and newspapers throughout the country. His musical criticism is backed by his years as bass clarinetist with the Civic Orchestra of Chicago.

Formerly engaged in "ranching, business and teaching in Greybull, Wyoming," JAY C. KNODE is Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, University of New Mexico. He is the author of several books and also the editor and principal author of *Foundations of an American Philosophy of Education.*

Medical Director of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, Consultant to the United States Public Health Service, and Chairman of the Mental Hygiene Committee of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor, GEORGE S. STEVENSON serves THE AMERICAN SCHOLAR well as special editorial adviser in psychiatry.

ERIC BERGER, now a private in the United States Army, was a member of the editorial staff of Scholastic Publications as editor of *World Week* and news, national, and foreign affairs editor of *Scholastic*. His free-lance articles have appeared in a variety of popular periodicals.

Special editorial adviser in the field of mathematics, R. G. D. RICHARDSON is Dean of the Graduate School and head of the mathematics department at Brown University where he now guides the development of a program in those sectors of applied mathematics that were formerly dependent upon European research.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Index to Volume 12

Names of authors in *italics;* main articles in **bold face.**
The pagination of the volume is divided as follows: Winter, 1-128; Spring, 129-256; Summer, 257-384; Autumn, 385-512.
Indexed in the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*

Abbott, Jere, 374
Abel, Darrel, 414
Abell, Walter, 79
About Our Authors, 126, 253, 383, 509
Agriculture and the War, *Henry C. Taylor,* 377
Albert Brisbane: Social Dreamer, *Charles A. Madison,* 284
American Art — Is It Neglected?, *Jerome Mellquist,* 153
American Contributions to the Science of Hypnosis, Some, *Frank A. Pattie,* 444
Anglo-American Future, The, *Sir Frederick Whyte,* 314
Anglo-American Misunderstanding, *Harold Nicolson,* 20
Archaeology, Recent Greek and Roman, *Gisela M. A. Richter,* 243
Argentina, The Outlook for Democracy in, *J. Fred Rippy,* 74
Art and Man's Fortune, Man's, *Walter Abell,* 79
Art — Is It Neglected?, American, *Jerome Mellquist,* 153
Baczewski, Alexander, 125
Barber, Carter, 125
Benedict, Ruth F., 3
Benjamin Franklin as Scientist and Citizen, *I. Bernard Cohen,* 474
Berger, Eric, 507
Bishop, John Peale, 216
Brisbane: Social Dreamer, Albert, *Charles A. Madison,* 284
Broomell, Myron H., 381
Buddhist Devotion, *Mary Evelyn Clarke,* 362
Butler, Ovid, 375
Case Against Proportional Representation, The, *F. A. Hermens,* 174, 380
Case For Proportional Representation, The, *George H. Hallett, Jr.,* 161
Cassirer, Ernst, 5
Clarke, Mary Evelyn, 362
Cohen, I. Bernard, 474
Cohn, Alfred E., 352
College and the Century of the Common Man, *Algo D. Henderson,* 466
Commager, Henry Steele, 261
Composer, Plight of the American, *Alfred Frankenstein,* 482
Constant Stars, The, *Joel Stebbins,* 339
Costigan, Giovanni, 250
Counterfeit Fishes, *Charles I. Long,* 297
Critical Principles and a Sonnet, *Donald A. Stauffer,* 52
Dance Completes a Cycle, The, *John Martin,* 205
Darrow, Karl K., 321
Democracy, Socialism *versus* European, *Ludwig von Mises,* 220, 379
Earle, Edward Mead, 430
Editorials: *Ruth F. Benedict,* 3, *John W. Nason,* 133, *Henry S. Commager,* 261, *Harlow Shapley,* 389
Exiled Physicians in the United States, *Alfred E. Cohn,* 352
Felipe: Poet of Spain's Tragedy, Leon, *Bertram D. Wolfe,* 330
Fine Arts and the War, *Jere Abbott,* 374
Fishes, Counterfeit, *Charles I. Long,* 297
Forestry and the War, *Ovid Butler,* 375
Formosa and Japan's "Peace," *Anonymous,* 273
Foster, Nell K. A., 429
Frankenstein, Alfred, 482
Franklin as Scientist and Citizen, Benjamin, *I. Bernard Cohen,* 474
Freedom and the Liberal Arts, *Wendell Willkie,* 135
Friedrich List, Forerunner of Pan-Germanism, *Edward Mead Earle,* 430
Fundamentals of Peace, *Hans Kohn,* 401
Galileo: a New Science and a New Spirit, *Ernst Cassirer,* 5
Gauss, Christian, 143
Geography for War and for Peace, *John K. Wright,* 118
George William Hill, **Eric Berger,** 504
German Universities Centers of Reaction, *Alexander Baczewski,* 125
Germany, Liberal Socialism Proposed for, *Stephan Lackner,* 220, 379, 508
Gibson, Daniel, 92, 250
Gray, J. Glenn, 186
Haines, Aubrey B., 381
Hallett, George H., Jr., 161
Henderson, Algo D., 466
Hermens, F. A., 174
Hibbard, Addison, 313
Hill, George William, *Eric Berger,* 507
Houghton, Norris, 306
Hypnosis, Some American Contributions to the Science of, *Frank A. Pattie,* 444
Intellectual Criticism, *Darrel Abel,* 414
Jan Christiaan Smuts and the Union of South Africa, *Henry M. Moolman,* 391
Japan's "Peace," Formosa and, *Anonymous,* 273
Knode, Jay C., 490
Kohn, Hans, 401
Lackner, Stephan, 232
Leon Felipe: Poet of Spain's Tragedy, *Bertram D. Wolfe,* 330
Less Moonlight and Roses, *Louis B. Wright,* 263
Liberal Arts, Freedom and the, *Wendell Willkie,* 135
Liberal Socialism Proposed for Germany, *Stephan Lackner,* 232, 379, 508
List, Forerunner of Pan-Germanism, Friedrich, *Edward Mead Earle,* 430
Long, Charles I., 297
Madison, Charles A., 284
Man's Art and Man's Fortune, *Walter Abell,* 79
Marshall, Roy K., 42
Martin, John, 205

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mathematics and the War, *R. G. D. Richardson*, 503
Mellquist, Jerome, 153
Miller, Edward M., 455
Moolman, Henry M., 391
Nason, John W., 133
Navy, A Salute from the, *Carter Barber*, 125
Nicolson, Harold, 20
Nollen, John Scholte, 379
Ohlson, W., 251
Our Universe, *Roy K. Marshall*, 42
Outlook for Democracy in Argentina, The, *J. Fred Rippy*, 74
Pattie, Frank A., 444
"Peace," Formosa and Japan's, *Anonymous*, 273
Peace, Fundamentals of, *Hans Kohn*, 401
Peace, Geography for War and for, *John K. Wright*, 118
Pedagogues and Pedagese, *Daniel Gibson*, 92, 249
Phi Beta Kappa, Wartime Policy of, *Christian Gauss*, 143
Physicians in the United States, Exiled, *Alfred Cohn*, 352
Plato the Greek and Santayana the Cosmopolitan, *J. Glenn Gray*, 186
Plight of the American Composer, *Alfred Frankenstein*, 482
Poole, Hazel B., 508
Pottinger, David T., 63
Printing?, What Next in, *David T. Pottinger*, 63
Problems of World Government, *J. Gordon Stanier*, 124
Proportional Representation, The Case against, *F. A. Hermens*, 174
Proportional Representation, The Case for, *George H. Hallett, Jr.*, 161
Psychiatry and the War, *George S. Stevenson*, 503
Recent Greek and Roman Archaeology, *Gisela M. A. Richter*, 243
Revolution of the Twentieth Century, The, *Albert Viton*, 29
Rich, Stephen G., 249
Richardson, R. G. D., 503
Richter, Gisela M. A., 243
Rippy, J. Fred, 74
Sancton, Thomas, 105
Sanctuary, *A Poem, Nell K. A. Foster*, 429
Santayana the Cosmopolitan, Plato the Greek and, *J. Glenn Gray*, 186
Sapir, Louis, 508
Scientist and Citizen, Benjamin Franklin as, *I. Bernard Cohen*, 474
Seasongood, Murray, 380
Shapley, Harlow, 389
Smuts and the Union of South Africa, Jan Christiaan, *Henry M. Moolman*, 391
Socialism Proposed for Germany, Liberal, *Stephan Lochner*, 232, 379, 508
Socialism *versus* European Democracy, *Ludwig von Mises*, 220, 379
Some American Contributions to the Science of Hypnosis, *Frank A. Pattie*, 444
Sonnet, Critical Principles and a, *Donald A. Stauffer*, 52
South and the North: A Southern View, The, *Thomas Sancton*, 105
Spain's Tragedy, Leon Felipe: Poet of, *Bertram D. Wolfe*, 330
Spencer, Bonnell, 250
Stanier, J. Gordon, 124
Stars, The Constant, *Joel Stebbins*, 339
Stauffer, Donald A., 52
Stebbins, Joel, 339
Stevenson, George S., 503
Strauss, William V., 251
Subject of Sea Change, A, *A Poem, John Peale Bishop*, 216
Taylor, Henry C., 377
Theater for the Common Man, *Norris Houghton*, 306, 508
"There'll Always be an England," On, *Bonnell Spencer, Giovanni Costigan*, 250
Thomas, Norman, 379
Transmutation, *Karl K. Darrow*, 321
Two Worlds, *A Poem, Agnes Yarnall*, 40
U. S. A., A Westerner Views the, *Edward M. Miller*, 455
Vermont Day, *A Poem, Addison Hibbard*, 313
Virtue and Talents, *Jay C. Knode*, 490
Viton, Albert, 29
von Mises, Ludwig, 220
War and for Peace, Geography for, *John K. Wright*, 118
War, Forestry and the, *Ovid Butler*, 375
War, Mathematics and the, *R. G. D. Richardson*, 503
War, Psychiatry and the, *George S. Stevenson*, 505
Wartime Policy of Phi Beta Kappa, *Christian Gauss*, 143
Westerner Views the U. S. A., A., *Edward M. Miller*, 455
What Next in Printing?, *David T. Pottinger*, 63
Whyte, Sir Frederick, 314
Willkie, Wendell, 135
Wolfe, Bertram D., 330
Wright, John K., 118
Wright, Louis B., 263
Yarnall, Agnes, 40

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The L. G. BALFOUR COMPANY

is proud of the DOUBLE DUTY
we are doing in serving

The Undergraduates and Fraternity Men and Women in the Armed Forces

★

THE HIGH STANDARDS OF PHI BETA KAPPA INSIGNIA ARE BEING MAINTAINED

SERVICE INSIGNIA AVAILABLE

Army Seal	Navy Seal
Army Wings	Navy Wings
Wing and Propeller	Navy Anchor
	Marine Seal

Members of Phi Beta Kappa with friends and relatives in the Service might select the gift shown at left—to be mailed early for Christmas delivery. Shipments of up to 8 oz. are permitted overseas at 1st class postage.

580-44 Billfold Pass Case Saddle sheepskin leather with branch of service insignia blind embossed on cover to give hand-tooled effect. Two card pockets, bill compartment, and four transparent wings each of which will hold two cards or photos.

BLIND EMBOSSED SERVICE INSIGNIA
$3.50 (no tax)

BLIND EMBOSSED SERVICE INSIGNIA, SOCIAL FRATERNITY CREST METAL MOUNTED
$4.25 (add 10% tax)

Name gold stamped on billfold at 25¢ additional. Hand print instructions.

Sole Official Jeweler to Phi Beta Kappa

L. G. BALFOUR COMPANY

Attleboro, Massachusetts

RUMFORD PRESS
CONCORD, N. H.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MAGAZINE PRINTING

From our infancy we have *specialized* in the Printing of Magazines. Our present list of publications ranges from the popular pocket magazines to literary and scientific journals of an international character. Each one receives the same meticulous care that characterizes any magazine or book bearing the *Rumford Imprint.*

THE RUMFORD PRESS

CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Branch Offices in Boston and New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED